A0363
1975

A0363

1975

IGSL

PROBATION DEPARTMENT

1975

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

MAR 1 1977

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ANNUAL REPORT

PROBATION SERVICES

IN

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY

REPORT OF THE PROBATION OFFICER

For the Year 1975

123 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California

A0363
1975

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES LIBRARY
109 PHILOSOPHY HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CA 94720

COURT HOUSE

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

PROBATION DEPARTMENT

123 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California

OFFICE OF
CLIFFORD C. ROMER
PROBATION OFFICER

Post Office Box 1379
Zip Code 93102
Phone: (805) 966-4164

The Honorable Floyd C. Dodson
The Honorable Charles Stevens, Jr.
The Honorable John A. Westwick
The Honorable Arden T. Jensen
The Honorable John T. Rickard
The Honorable Robert L. Trapp
The Honorable Royce Lewellen

Gentlemen:

To fulfill the requirement set forth in Section 1203.11 of the Penal Code of California that the Chief Probation Officer submit a report of the Probation Department to the Superior Court annually, we are hereby submitting the following Annual Report.

In the year of 1975, the adult probation units were hard pressed to keep up with the volume of referrals sent to them by the Courts, with the emphasis once again on the offenses of drinking and driving. Especially in the Santa Barbara office, the Adult Supervision Unit has suffered from a handicap of a shortage of staff due to a series of mishaps that kept officers out of the Unit, and made it necessary for other officers to cover their own caseloads and part of another many times.

The referrals to the Juvenile Units remain much the same, however the caliber of minor being referred has changed in the last few years to a more hardened type of offender who requires more intensified supervision. Although changes in the Juvenile Court Law have been considered for the past several years, a suitable law has yet to be passed that would deter the minor from embarking on a career of violence if the inclination was there. At this point, there are several Bills in the State Legislature that would change the Court processes, especially for the 16 and 17 year-old offender. Which, if any, of these will be put into law remains to be seen, however it is a foregone conclusion that one of them will probably be passed this year.

Two Day Care Treatment Centers are in operation at this point, with the third one to be opened early in 1976. There is a Center in Santa Barbara, Villa Esperanza, and one in Lompoc, Casa Floral. Added to the well established placement facilities in the County, Los Prietos Boys' Camp, and La Morada Girls' Residence, these Centers are helping minors to complete school under the supervision of Probation Officers on a day by day basis, without 24-hour placement. The new Center in Santa Maria will further aid probationers in that area. It is hoped that another Center might be opened in the coming year in the Santa Barbara area to further assist those minors who are having problems in attending school.

Without the aid of other County Departments, Law Enforcement Agencies, City and County Schools, and the public and private agencies that work with us for the good of the Community, we could not attain any measure of success in our efforts to rehabilitate offenders. We wish to express our appreciation to them for their continued cooperation and willingness to help us whenever the need arises.

It is the hope of the Probation Department Staff that the year to come will be one of accomplishment, and that we will be able to properly serve the community.

Respectfully submitted,

Clifford C. Romer

CLIFFORD C. ROMER
CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

CCR:rss

ADMINISTRATION

CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER:
CLIFFORD C. ROMER

ASSISTANT CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER:
DARYL D. BARTSCH

ASSISTANT CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER:
DALE J. HARRINGTON

COURT STRUCTURE

December 31, 1976

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES:

Honorable Floyd C. Dodson
Honorable Charles Stevens, Jr.
Honorable John A. Westwick
Honorable Arden T. Jensen
Honorable John T. Rickard
Honorable Robert L. Trapp
Honorable Royce R. Lewellen

MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGES:

Honorable Arnold Gowans
Honorable Frank P. Kearney
Honorable Joseph Lodge
Honorable Jon Gudmunds
Honorable Robert G. Eckhoff

JUSTICE COURT JUDGES:

Honorable Terrill F. Cox
Honorable James L. Pattillo
Honorable Robert R. Stewart

JUVENILE COURT REFEREES:

Yale D. Coggan
Richard St. John

COURT ADMINISTRATOR:

Allen Abersman

JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION COMMISSIONS

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

1975

Mrs. Catherine Carey, Chairman	Santa Maria
Mrs. William Brace	Santa Barbara
Mr. Earl W. Calvert	Lompoc
Mrs. June S. Christensen	Solvang
Mr. John P. Franklin	Santa Barbara
Dr. George J. Hall	Santa Barbara
Mr. Virgil D. Loken	Lompoc
Mr. William Luton	Santa Ynez
Mr. Luis D. Ogas	Lompoc
Mrs. J. Kenneth Patterson	Santa Barbara
Dr. Eleazar Ruiz	Carpinteria
Mrs. Margaret Wainwright	Santa Maria
Mrs. Mary Walton	Santa Barbara
Reverend L. Leander Wilkes	Santa Barbara
Mr. James Woodard	Santa Barbara

Juvenile Justice Commission appointed by:

Superior Court Judges

Delinquency Prevention Commission appointed by:

Board of Supervisors

WHAT NEXT IN THE FIELD OF CORRECTIONS?

By: Clifford C. Romer
Chief Probation Officer

With the reduction of the birth rate in the Country since 1960, the reduction in the number of persons in a family declining in the last decade, the accelerated annual divorce rate since 1960, the leveling off of immigrants coming into our Nation on an annual basis, the high rate of youthful crime, along with high instances of social problems in the ghetto in our big cities, it would seem that there must be some drastic changes in the handling of our youthful and adult offenders if our society hopes to affect any meaningful changes in the conduct of our society in the future. Between 1960 and 1974, arrests of juveniles for all crimes increased by 138 percent, and persons under 18 now account for 45% of all arrests for serious crimes and for 23% of all arrests for violent crimes.

Penologists have maintained for many years that prisons and large youth correction facilities are breeding grounds for more sophisticated criminals. It is believed there is little, if any, rehabilitation affected in these institutions in reducing recidivism. Prisons do accomplish the removal of the criminal from society for a period of time, and punishes the offender. It is believed that the assurance of punishment by implementation would cause the offender to have second thoughts about committing criminal offenses. Swift justice and imprisonment for second or subsequent felony offenders will have an impact on lawlessness over the Nation today. Decentralising the highly volatile ghetto and criminal areas of our Nation are essential. Society should develop more meaningful current trade programs to give the offender who wishes to go straight an opportunity to do so. Development of more adequate and humane kinds of institutions to house the long term criminal is essential, so that he will not be able to be out on the street offending citizens again in an unreasonably short period of time. It is believed that County Probation Departments and State Parole Agencies, as they are administered today, will be completely revamped in the next decade. They probably will be known and function as a community resource agency.

There is a growing belief that youthful status offenders should be handled in non-secure facilities, and handled on a community referral basis rather than being referred to a criminal justice system. Some areas of our Nation have been experimenting with this concept with reported good success. The State of California Probation Subsidy, as we know it today, should be reversed. The emphasis should be placed on prevention, not after the fact. Most Counties in California are experimenting with diversion programs today.

In a study made by Martin Gold and David J. Reimer, "Changing Patterns of Delinquency, 1967-72" the following is stated:

> *"The frequency and seriousness of delinquent behavior among American boys 13 to 16 years old in 1972 were lower than the delinquent behavior of that age group in 1967, but the delinquent behavior of girls may have been more frequent in 1972. The substance of the behavior of American adolescents had changed markedly, more of these young people using drugs, mostly marijuana, more frequently in 1972, than their counterparts did in 1967. Indeed, except for this more frequent use of drugs (including alcohol) the delinquent behavior of girls had not increased and the delinquent behavior of boys had actually declined."*

> *"The increased use of drugs is most marked among 15 and 16-year-olds; among girls the increase is probably limited to that age group. Adolescents from all social strata gave evidence of the same trend, but the increase in the use of drugs seems most sharp among boys of middle status. Rural boys and girls do not seem to have participated in this shift to drug use."*

Since our current practices in handling both youth and adult offenders have come under much scrutiny as to their effectiveness in attempting to curb crime, we should place our major emphasis in the area of delinquency prevention both for adults as well as minors. Mr. Allen Breed, Director of the California Youth Authority, wrote an article for the California Youth Authority Quarterly in the fall of 1974, entitled "The Dilemma of Punishment and Rehabilitation, in which he said:

> *"Most important of all, we must step up our efforts in the area of delinquency prevention. A major portion of our nation's criminal activity is carried on by young people who, by entering the criminal justice system, tend to make illegal activity a lifetime career. It is this phenomenon, more than anything else, that is responsible for the nation's deplorable crime rate. If delinquency can be prevented, and it can; if young people can be kept out of the justice system, and they should; the virulence of crime would quickly wither away."*

From the 1974 Report on Crime in the United States, the crime factors were listed in this manner:

> *"Density and size of the community population and the metropolitan area of which it is a part.*

Composition of the population with reference particularly to age, sex and race.

Economic status and mores of the population.

Stability of population, including commuters, seasonal, and other transient types.

Climate, including seasonal weather conditions.

Educational, recreational, and religious characteristics.

Effective strength of the police force.

Standards of appointments to the local police force.

Policies of the prosecuting officials.

Attitudes and policies of the courts and corrections.

Relationships and attitudes of law enforcement and the community.

Administrative and investigative efficiency of law enforcement, including degree of adherence to crime reporting standards. Organization and cooperation of adjoining and overlapping police jurisdictions."

Perhaps by the year 2000, we can hope that through our trial and error experimenting to try to cure the ills of our society, we will have achieved a greater measure of success, and have answers to some of the problems that we seem to lack today.

PROBATION SERVICES

By: Daryl D. Bartsch
Assistant Chief Probation Officer

During 1975 the Probation Department witnessed an increase in not only Probation services, but in staff to carry out those services. As to the latter, we have suffered disappointments in achieving the full staffing pattern due to hiring "freezes" that have been applied for economic reasons. The Department's programming has not only been able to meet the traditional needs of mandated services, but also has demonstrated flexibility in areas which were visibly in need of unique services. The Department has continued to supervise the D.U.I.L. Program for Drunk Drivers, has cooperated with County Mental Health in control substance diversions, and has

maintained a juvenile diversion program for those youngsters who reasonably do not justify Juvenile Court involvement.

The Probation Department's mission to investigate civil and criminal matters, along with providing necessary supervision for those individuals who are placed on probation, should remain as an ongoing priority in order to provide to the community suitable protection while at the same time offering to the client services that will assist in his or her rehabilitation.

REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

By: Dale J. Harrington
Assistant Chief Probation Officer

During 1975 regular monthly meetings were held between the Superintendents of Los Prietos Boys' Camp, La Morada Residence for Teenage Girls, Juvenile Hall, and the Director of the Day Care Centers and me. These meetings last about four hours, and the topics are varied. Some time was spent for the development of uniform data collection. Since a computerized data system is not available to us, we are initiating a system that is basic, but which can at least provide some profile indications and "tracking" of the wards who leave the programs. Some of this has been done in the past, but not in the coordinated way we now plan.

A priority of these monthly meetings has been the sharing of ideas about program betterment as well as some brainstorming of basic concepts about treatment. Also, during the year plans were finalized for the new Juvenile Hall in Santa Maria, which is scheduled to open in 1976.

Delinquency Prevention activities continued with the officers working with numerous agencies and organizations throughout the County to assist them in planning activities and/or programs for youth. In February we sponsored a Delinquency Prevention Institute in Solvang. Persons from throughout the County attended and participated in discussions about the Federal Delinquency Prevention Act.

We developed a program outline and a drawing for a Diagnostic and Treatment Center for the County. For the time being any formalized planning has been deferred.

We continued to work with the Juvenile Justice Commission/ Delinquency Prevention Commissions of the County as staff assistants and resource persons.

Much work has been spent this year in discussing the future contract arrangements with Ventura County for the use of Los Prietos Boys' Camp for juveniles from Ventura County. Ventura no longer wants to be a part owner of the Camp. These arrangements should be finalized in 1976.

Work continued through 1975 with the Santa Barbara Residence for Teenage Girls, Inc. through their very intensive and varied services for the improvement of living conditions for girls placed at La Morada.

During 1975 procedures manuals for the facilities and Day Care were either written, updated, or completed. I am pleased with the efforts and results. During 1976 we will be evaluating the manuals and making structured revisions where necessary as well as ongoing content updating.

During 1975 the facility Superintendents, Day Care Director, and I participated in "Work Sessions" with Supervisors of units with responsibility for handling work regarding juveniles, the Training Officer, the County Probation Officer, and the other Assistant County Probation Officer. The sessions were designed to discuss mutual concerns or ideas. I believe these sessions were fruitful.

Planning was started in developing what we are calling Specialized Care Homes. Initially these homes will be coordinated by the Day Care Centers. They are privately owned homes designed to handle juveniles who require fairly intensive supervision. Implementation of these homes will take place in 1976.

Work started in 1975 to develop our third Day Care Center which will be in Santa Maria. This will be a much needed resource in that area to help provide services for juveniles within their own community.

Towards the end of 1975 the Board of Supervisors of the County established a Juvenile Justice Master Plan Task Force with which several Department staff and I are working.

The activities for an entire year are very difficult to capsulize. The above comments reflect some of these. We are moving into 1976 with positive attitudes and are anxious to test some different ideas. We want to continue to improve our capabilities and resources to assist our clients and the others with whom we work.

PROBATION SERVICES

ADULT INTAKE, SANTA BARBARA
JOSEPH G. SARAGOSA, SUPERVISING OFFICER

ADULT SUPERVISION, SANTA BARBARA
MARGARET NORDYKE, SUPERVISING OFFICER

JUVENILE INTAKE AND INVESTIGATION, SANTA BARBARA
JESSIE H. GRAHAM, SUPERVISING OFFICER

JUVENILE SUPERVISION, SANTA BARBARA
ROBERT E. BRISBY, SUPERVISING OFFICER

ADULT INTAKE, JUVENILE, SANTA MARIA
EILEEN F. POWELL, SUPERVISING OFFICER

ADULT SUPERVISION, SANTA MARIA
GEORGE A. TOULOUSE, SUPERVISING OFFICER

LOMPOC, ADULT AND JUVENILE
EDWARD G. LEWIS, SUPERVISING OFFICER

ADULT INTAKE AND INVESTIGATION, SANTA BARBARA OFFICE

By: Joseph G. Saragosa
Supervising Probation Officer

In reviewing the assignments out of the Santa Barbara Office, three categories of offenses head the list, i.e. Drugs, Assaults (includes Armed Robberies) and Thefts (excludes unlawful taking of vehicles). The first category of offenders, drug users, was of such volume that many, because they were first time offenders, found themselves being diverted, and were ordered to participate in community drug rehabilitation programs. Unfortunately, the alcoholic drunk driver also found himself as a recidivist and had to spend time in custody.

One of the most alarming problems felt by investigators was that offenders have been more involved in committing assaultive offenses upon the citizenry of Santa Barbara. Of special note is the fact that many defendants have been involved and arrested for committing the offense of Armed Robbery. It is safe to say that the offense itself is symptomatic of another social problem, drug abuse.

Thefts in general were also high in Santa Barbara during 1975. Again, many of these crimes were committed by drug abusers, some of whom were on probation. From all indications, when probationers are again arrested and convicted, and if they have a drug problem, narcotic addiction petitions are usually filed and the defendants are subsequently committed to the California Rehabilitation Center at Corona. It is interesting to observe that when these defendants are initially arrested, no mention is made of their drug problem. Once re-arrested, they are "addicted" and want treatment at the California Rehabilitation Center rather than being committed to the Adult Authority. With new legislation pending, it is anticipated that many first time drug (marijuana) arrests will no longer be "diverted" but will be adjudicated by the imposition of a small fine. Speculation is that the lessening of punishment for possession of marijuana is the forerunner of legalization in the near future. Whatever changes occur, one thing is certain, the legislature is taking a close and hard look at the whole drug abuse scene.

The writer is appreciative of all those agencies that day by day assist our Department in fulfilling our obligations to the community, the Courts and the probationers.

ADULT SUPERVISION, SANTA BARBARA

By: Margaret Nordyke
Supervising Probation Officer

The Adult Supervision Unit currently consists of one Supervising Probation Officer and fifteen Assistant Probation Officers. The unit is responsible for the supervision of about 4,300 adult cases. Included among the duties of the unit is the assignment of a parole officer who is obligated to conduct parole investigations of those persons applying for parole and then submitting reports to the Parole Board with recommendations for or against the granting of parole. The parole officer is also responsible for supervising those individuals granted parole.

An additional duty of the unit is to provide a work coordinator for the Santa Barbara County work program. This program enables the Courts to order probationers to do public work in lieu of fines or merely as an additional condition of probation. The work coordinator develops the job locations, assigns the probationer to the particular task and in conjunction with the job supervisor confirms the acceptable completion of the work hours assigned.

The adult unit continues to carry a tremendous volume of cases with most of the offenses involved related to drinking and driving and drug use and sale. In spite of establishing three "bank" caseloads, the working caseloads have still grown to alarming proportions. The state of the National economy has been felt by the County and there has been freezes placed on filling vacancies and granting promotions. Because of this combination of factors, 1975 will be remembered as a year that has created extreme hardships for everyone in adult supervision. The individual officer has found himself heavily involved in paper shuffling while case work has diminished to almost nonexistence. Only by virtue of taking advantage of extra help and the volunteer program has the unit been able to function with any degree of efficiency.

The unit continues to be involved in the management and coordination of the Court ordered alcohol information programs. The Phase II, ten week course, has been continuously evaluated and upgraded, and at the present represents one of the best alcohol information courses available in the State of California.

ADULT SUPERVISION UNIT, SANTA MARIA

By: George Toulouse
Supervising Probation Officer

On June 23, 1975, the Adult Supervision Unit, consisting of a total of 10 persons (8 Probation Officers and 2 Clerks) moved to our present location. In addition to the Supervision Unit, the North County Delinquency Prevention Officer and the North County Civil Investigations Officer (Stepparent Adoptions, Custody Investigations, etc.) each have an office in the building.

The building, previously a delapidated laundromat, was completely renovated for the County with wall to wall carpet, paneling, air conditioning, counters, cabinets, offices and the like.

The move went smoothly and various anticipated problems did not materialize. We thought that being half a mile from the Courthouse would be a problem. The Judges have been very considerate and seldom call for a Probation Officer to appear in Court on short notice. Even our new probationers are finding their way from Court to the office without too much delay. Our problems consisted of shortages of furniture, two Datsun vehicles for use by full sized Probation Officers, an electric typewriter older than the clerk assigned to it, no paper towels or toilet paper, no janitorial service, etc. These problems have now been solved by requests or requisitions through the proper channels or by other ingenious methods.

On February 9, 1976, we went on the 9-80 work schedule with the office being open from 7:30 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. which seems to be working to the benefit of our clients and to the Department. Our workload seems fairly stable at about 1350 clients. By recognized caseload standards we are short a few Probation Officers, which is a common complaint. This matter has also been reported, budgetary requests have been made, and the matter of personnel increases is in the hands of those who approve budgets. We anticipate no problems of any great magnitude in the next year.

OWN RECOGNIZANCE - BAIL REDUCTION PROGRAM

By: Maurice McDermott
Senior Probation Officer

Again this year we have been able to increase the percentage of own recognizance releases with a minimum of failures to appear. The majority of misdemeanor offenders in the Santa Barbara area are released on the citation release system, either at the scene of the offense, or after booking at the County Jail. Those offenders not granted release after investigation by the officers, are automatically referred to the O/R Unit at their arraignment.

In 1975 the O/R Unit received 1334 referrals from the Courts. Of those eligible, 51% were recommended for and granted their release on their own recognizance. This is a 10% increase over the year 1973, and a 4.4% increase over last year. Of those defendants that were denied release on own recognizance, but were granted bail reductions, approximately 50% were able to gain their release at the lower bail.

The following is a summary of the activities for 1975:

Own Recognizance - Bail Reduction Referrals	1334
No Recommendations submitted due to bail-outs, pleas of guilt during investigation, or sentenced	278
Total Recommendations submitted to Courts	1056
Total not eligible for release due to Holds, transient, sentenced	252
Total eligible for release	804
Own Recognizance recommended	412
Percentage of those eligible for release recommended	51%
Bail Reductions recommended	134
Known Failures to Appear	24
Municipal Court Referrals	1292
Superior Court Referrals	23
Justice Court Referrals	19
Misdemeanor Referrals	929
Felony Referrals	405

JUVENILE INTAKE AND INVESTIGATION UNIT, SANTA BARBARA
COURT HEARING OFFICER

By: Larry L. Dunham
Assistant Probation Officer

When matters initiated by the Probation Department are handled by the Juvenile Court, it is necessary for a Probation Officer to be present. The Court Probation Officer, or CHO as he is referred to, appears daily for South County area non-subsidy cases at various stages of the proceedings, i.e. first appearance-on-transfer, fitness, contested jurisdictional (evidentiary), and dispositional hearings.

The CHO's role has been expanded over the past twelve months because of increased workload generally within the Juvenile Division and specifically within the intake/investigation unit as to the responsibility for social study reports on all "first time" dispositions. Because the officers within the intake/investigation and line supervision units find it difficult to be in Court and to handle the many other duties of their workloads simultaneously, additional work (except in contested extra-parental placements) has been assumed by the CHO. Thus, approximately 60% of all Probation Department South County cases are handled by the CHO.

Appearance in Court is not the only time-consuming activity of the CHO. "Pre" and "Post" Court activities include: reviewing the Court calendar to assure the CHO has the necessary files; reviewing each file (reading petition, police reports, probation reports, prior court orders, note preparation for hearing); meeting with District Attorney and minor's counsel, witnesses, and parents who may have questions while waiting for Court; and the relaying of information to probation officer for action on the Court's order.

Benefits of the CHO position to the Department are: continuity in handling Court cases, release of other personnel to handle other duties, Court liaison, and public relations. Because the CHO is the Department's visible representative in Juvenile Court on a daily basis, he becomes a medium for communicating ideas, problems, policies, and information between the Court and the Department. Further, he is ocassionally sought out by other juvenile justice workers for information, policy, case background, etc.

JUVENILE INVESTIGATION AND SUPERVISION UNIT

By: Robert E. Brisby
Supervising Probation Officer

This Unit consists of five Assistant Probation Officers and two Senior Probation Officers assigned various tasks.

Four Assistant Probation Officers have an average caseload of 55 cases and complete three supplemental reports per month. Needless to say, they are continuously busy. Unfortunately they cannot devote a lot of their time doing casework supervision, as other Court and related functions require immediate attention.

Like last year, there continues to be an increase in the family-related problem areas due possibly to the cases that have been tried in the Diversion Unit and are later referred for extra-parental needs. More and more emphasis is shown in the family relationships and working with the total family unit rather than with the individuals.

The Probation Officer more and more is finding his role to be that of a coordinator of community programs and adding into his caseload the things that he feels might be needed. Extra-parental placements have been quite high this past year. This again is possibly due to the cases which, when finally reaching the Court, have been tried on numerous diversion types of programs and now are in need of Court-placed facilities. One Senior Probation Officer, among her other activities, acts as a placement officer and has in her caseload extra-parental placements outside the County. However, due to the number of minors placed extra-parentally, the caseload would be too large for one Probation Officer to handle, so this has left all the officers with a small number of extra-parental placements in their caseloads.

The other Senior Probation Officer is assigned to traffic hearing responsibilities and sealing of Juvenile records. This takes all of his time and his report statistics are contained elsewhere in this Annual Report.

Continued volunteer participation by Westmont students and U.C.S.B. students has proven again and again a real savings and educational experience both to the students and minors who they have worked with during the past year. This is the fourth year this unit has used volunteers and all agree that it is probably one of the best programs in the unit we have.

We continue to thank Westmont and U.C.S.B. for working with us in this cooperative effort.

SANTA MARIA JUVENILE, ADULT INTAKE UNIT:

By: Eileen F. Powell
Supervising Probation Officer

The year 1975 brought a number of changes to the office located at 312 East Cook Street in Santa Maria. On June 23rd, the Adult Supervision Unit moved into separate quarters at 115 E. Fesler Street with George Toulouse as Supervisor, leaving Eileen Powell to supervise the Adult Investigation Unit and the Juvenile Investigation and Supervision Units.

Also on June 23rd, Judge Dodson's order went into effect whereby the officers involved in handling juveniles are required to work on a weekly rotating basis as Detention/Release Officers. The officer on duty during the week is required to be on "beeper duty" from 5:00 P.M. to 11:00 P.M. Monday through Friday, and from 8:00 A.M. to 11:00 P.M. on weekends and holidays. Needless to say, this is not a popular duty as only the officers with juvenile caseloads are assigned this additional responsibility. It is hoped that with the opening of the North County Juvenile Hall priority will be given to the hiring or deputizing of probation staff at Juvenile Hall to handle the Detention/Release duty.

On July 11, 1975, Richard St. John was sworn in as Referee of the Juvenile Court for North County. His temporary office was wherever a vacant desk and chair could be found. However, by November he had office and Court space in a new building adjoining the Sheriff's Substation on West Foster Road where all Juvenile Court hearings for the Santa Maria area are now held. With completion of the aforementioned Juvenile Hall in Santa Maria, Juvenile Court will move into permanent quarters.

On October 13, 1975, the building of a Juvenile Hall in Santa Maria was approved by the Board of Supervisors and construction is moving ahead quite rapidly. It is anticipated that the facility will be ready for occupancy in the Fall of 1976.

On October 20, 1975, the Special Supervision Unit in North County was re-activated with Don Wolf as Supervising Probation Officer. This unit is located at 112 West Tunnel, Santa Maria.

As to the work load, it has continued to increase but with no increase in probation personnel. Referral to other public and private agencies for assistance and services has helped to alleviate somewhat the problem of inadequate staffing.

In conclusion, the entire staff at 312 East Cook Street desires to take this opportunity to thank Chief Probation Officer Clifford C. Romer for his guidance and assistance throughout the year. His dedication and helpfulness are an inspiration to all.

REPORT OF THE LOMPOC PROBATION OFFICE

By: Edward G. Lewis
Supervising Probation Officer

1975 was a year of many personnel changes in the Lompoc Office due, in part, to staff reassignments. Current full time officer staff in the Lompoc Office includes one Supervising Probation Officer; two Senior Probation Officers, Mati Mesikep, and Alfred E. Hutton; seven Assistant Probation Officers, Richard T. Brittingham, Jack T. Congleton, James L. Crow, JoAnn Lundy, Edward J. Lupo and Thomas W. Nay, Jr. One position is vacant due to the County "freeze". Officers working on a part-time basis out of the Lompoc Office include Elwin C. Filipponi, who does Civil investigations; Stanton Clift, Delinquency Prevention Officer; and Hiro Goto, Traffic Hearing Officer. The four clerical positions assigned to Lompoc are most ably filled by Delors Fabrizio, Barbara Schuler, Ann Chait and Trudy Sosa.

Mr. Godinez was reassigned to the Santa Maria Office and Miss Eva Baranoff was reassigned to the Santa Barbara Office. Mr. Mesikep and Mr. Hutton were promoted to Senior Probation Officer positions. During the year two new officers were employed. Mr. Richard T. Brittingham graduated from the University of California at Santa Barbara with a degree in psychology. Also, he worked with the Probation Department in Santa Barbara as a volunteer while he was a student.

Statistically, 1975 showed that new cases assigned for intake and cases under supervision dropped off slightly. The number of hours required to complete investigations changed very little. The following chart is a brief overview showing the decreases. The figures include adult, juvenile and special investigation areas with regard to the three basic functions of casework; intake, investigation and supervision.

INTAKE	1972	1973	1974	1975
Total number of cases assigned for the year	1062	1258	1250	1073
INVESTIGATION				
Total number of hours used to complete investigations for a year	5988	7248	9180	9004
SUPERVISION				
Total number of cases under supervision during a month/ average	559	659	896	680

JUVENILE TRAFFIC HEARINGS - 1975

By: Hiro Goto
Traffic Hearing Officer

The total number of hearings conducted by the Juvenile Traffic Hearing Officer for the Santa Barbara County area during 1975 indicates an overall increase of 276 cases, or approximately 6% over 1974.

	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Santa Barbara	2,982	3,000	2,523	2,194	2,339
Santa Maria	1,161	1,467	1,820	1,623	1,619
Lompoc	560	404	564	663	798
Totals	4,703	4,871	4,907	4,480	4,756

In the Santa Barbara area, one of the difficulties encountered in scheduling is the inability to adhere strictly to the appointed time of the hearings. The main reason for this is the requirement of at least one parent or guardian who must accompany the minors. The total number of hearings scheduled for 1975 was 2,989, and the actual number of hearings conducted was 2,339.

The types of hearings conducted in the Santa Barbara area shows no significant change with the exception of the number of bicycle offenders, which indicates a decrease of 10%. How this reduction is reflected in the number of accidents involving bicycles during 1975 is not known at this writing.

	1972	1973	1974	1975
Motor Vehicles	72%	58%	53%	60%
Motorcycles	18%	24%	18%	19%
Bicycles	10%	18%	23%	13%
Others (pedestrians, dogs, skateboards, trespassing, etc.)	Negligible	Negligible	6%	8%

Among the senior high schools in the Santa Barbara area, the number of students percentage-wise referred to the Traffic Hearing Officer for all types of infractions does not show any significant changes:

	1974	1975
Bishop Diego Garcia	5%	4%
Dos Pueblos	26%	30%
La Cuesta	4%	2%
Laguna Blanca	1%	1%
San Marcos	27%	28%
Santa Barbara	37%	35%

As in the past, the Juvenile Court Referee and the Juvenile Traffic Hearing Officer direct students to attend Youth Traffic School. In 1975, there were 115 minors assigned to the five-week course. Mr. Hal Kilminster, who teaches Driver Education and Driver Training at San Marcos High School, uses the following course outline:

1. Introduction: Causes of vehicle accidents
   Speeding -- stopping distance and space cushion driving.
   Review Vehicle Code and new laws.

2. Intoxicated Drivers: Laws
   Problems with alcohol.
   Major violations -- accidents and death and injury.
   What can be done to solve the drinking driver problem.

3. Insurance: Liability
   Who is responsible in an accident?
   Types of insurance and importance of each.
   Cost of insurance and why.
   Driving records.

4. Law Enforcement: Laws
   Speaker: CHP Officer
   Problems of Law Enforcement.
   Defensive driving.
   Driving emergencies.

5. Developing good driving attitudes:
   Concern for others.
   Responsibility.
   Decision making.

The California Juvenile Traffic Courts Association workshop and seminars continue to improve in attendance and effectiveness. Attendance by Municipal Court Judges, Justice Court Judges, and Juvenile Court Referees in addition to the Traffic Hearing Officers have enhanced the quality of the meetings. One of the contributions of the association was the involvement in combating the passage of AB 2145. The proposed Bill provided that all vehicle code infractions incurred by the minor between the ages of 16 and 18 would be handled by the Municipal Courts and Justice Courts of the State. Throughout the State,

approximately 85% of the Juvenile Traffic Court calendar is devoted to minors who receive citations for driving infractions.

The knowledge of this Bill awaiting the Governor's signature did not reach the attention of the Juvenile Traffic Courts until September 10, 1975. Members of the legislative committee together with the help of the Central California Chief Probation Officer's Association, Assemblymen Ken Maddy and Ernest Mobley, the Honorable Frank C. Creede, Jr., Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, Fresno County, and many other interested parties urged the Governor to veto the Bill for the following reasons.

a. Many adult traffic courts function on a solely impersonal basis which engenders a lack of respect of the Courts. Many parents had expressed their disapproval of this procedure.

b. The adult courts are concerned primarily with punishment rather than rehabilitation.

c. Many juveniles were being handled in lower courts without their parents' knowledge. This undermines parental supervision and does not enable parents to assist in controlling juvenile offenders.

d. Teenage drivers were most vulnerable as to death and injury. Young drivers have twice as many accidents in proportion to their numbers as do other drivers. Not only do they have more smashups -- they have the worst.

e. A better educational approach is offered by the Juvenile Court process.

f. Most Juvenile Court Judges believed that transfer of juvenile traffic offenders to the adult courts would be a step backward.

If there is anything at all in the principle of special handling of juveniles which justified setting up the Juvenile Court, surely it must also apply to Juvenile traffic offenders, and Juvenile Traffic Court should be an extension of its parent, the Juvenile Court, in philosophy and action.

On September 20, 1975, AB 2145 was vetoed.

In years past, there has been no written recognition of the Traffic Clerks in the Santa Barbara, Lompoc, and Santa Maria offices. The smoothness of the Juvenile Traffic process depends wholly upon the efficiency, patience, and attention to detail provided by the Traffic Clerk. Because our

operation is a unit by itself, it is not apparent as to the numerous records and files that must be accurately kept -- from the receipt of the citations from various agencies, calendaring, notifications, dispositions, statistics, correspondence, and of utmost importance, public relations. (In the Santa Barbara office alone, 650 cases had to be rescheduled during 1975, and 285 cases were transferred to other counties). The Traffic Clerk, as well as the Traffic Hearing Officer, must be ever mindful that an appearance in Juvenile Traffic Court by minors and their parents may be the first and perhaps only exposure to the Courts, Probation Services, or to any form of County government. Therefore, a sincere thanks is due the Traffic Clerks for performing a professional function.

IN MEMORIAM

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with Kenneth L. Moos (Ken to us), will understand the void that was left when, after a painful illness, he passed away during this past year.

Ken could be categorized as "dedicated to mankind". He had very little time for personal pettiness or persons who violated their principles. His main thoughts and concerns were rehabilitation of those persons who were placed on probation by the Courts for whatever the offense. Many times he was observed handling a situation which most persons in this field of work would have considered an impossible task.

After twenty-three years in the Marine Corps, retiring as a Lieutenant Colonel in 1965, Ken came to the Probation Department as an Officer. He was liked by the people he contacted, and there seemed to be hardly a week go by that some person or agency did not call to acknowledge his polite, efficient and courteous way of handling situations of mutual concern.

It was a pleasure and honor to work with Ken, and we miss him very much. His memory is one that many of us cherish.

SPECIALIZED SERVICES

SPECIAL SUPERVISION
HILTON R. HEIMBACH, ACTING SUPERVISOR

SPECIAL SUPERVISION, SANTA MARIA
DONALD L. WOLF, SUPERVISING OFFICER

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION OFFICERS
ANTONY CHAPMAN, SOUTH COUNTY
STANTON H. CLIFT, NORTH COUNTY

TRAINING OFFICER
WILLIAM B. SCHENK

PSYCHOLOGIST
JEANNE TROTH

SPECIAL SUPERVISION, SANTA BARBARA

By: Hilton R. Heimbach
Acting Supervising Probation Officer

You will note that the title of this article is specified as Santa Barbara. This is because, after many years of need, a half Unit was again established in the North portion of the County, at Santa Maria. This half Unit is now functioning under the supervision of Mr. Donald Wolf, and with three officers. We sincerely welcome them to the program, and look forward to good rehabilitative programs in the North County.

Our Unit continued in the same general pattern as previously. Through the efforts of our non-profit corporation, Community Rehabilitation Programs, Inc., we cooperate closely with the CETA Program operators throughout the County, to further the efforts to secure meaningful employment for our untrained and out of work clientele. This effort continues to be one of our most important rehabilitative tools. The gaining of self-respect through good steady employment has indicated remarkable and valuable attitudinal changes in our people.

We also continue to expand the body fluid testing program for our narcotics users. Frequent laboratory analysis at a cycle which, in most cases, would ensure the detection of narcotics usage, has proved most effective in the rehabilitation efforts of this group. Not only has frequent testing supplied the supportive crutch to keep an individual from using, the certainty of a return to Court for a "dirty" test provides additional incentive to stay "clean". We consider this program one of our most successful.

The Unit moved into newer and larger quarters at 228 E. Cota Street in August, and it was certainly welcome and overdue. Our new offices are much larger, more comfortable and are much more conducive to our one-to-one counseling techniques and also, for the first time, provide for the desirable confidentiality of the client. In addition, there is now sufficient space to conduct one or more therapeutic group meetings at one time. All in all we expect our relocation to provide for much increased efficiency of operation on the part of our officers.

In mid-November, the Unit underwent a traumatic shock as a result of a major personnel change, but sure recovery is indicated, and it is expected that the Unit will continue as a viable and valuable arm of the Court and to the effective rehabilitation of those law offenders who require our services.

SPECIAL SUPERVISION, SANTA MARIA

By: Donald L. Wolf
Supervising Probation Officer

During the past year the decision was made to expand the Special Supervision office in Santa Maria. Office space was located at 112 West Tunnel Street, and the process of staffing and furnishing the office began during the latter part of the year. The staff was selected for and assigned to the Unit, with the last officer reporting near the end of January. The present staff includes Senior Probation Officer Richard King, Assistant Probation Officer Price Lutz, and Assistant Probation Officer Agatha Shorter. We also are fortunate in having two excellent persons handling the reception and clerical duties of the office, Beverly Enos and Polly Gabel.

Our main function over the past six months has been to allow the staff to become a functioning Unit in the tradition of Special Supervision. A good deal of time has been spent reviewing cases to be transferred to the Unit. Also, time was necessarily used to evaluate cases for assignment to individual officers in this Unit. Within the very near future, this Unit should complete the process of expanding our caseloads, and more energies can then be spent on areas of service to our probationers and the training of our officers.

This Unit has expanded contacts with other service agencies in North County in areas such as mental health, drug treatment, employment, job training, and foster homes, but, as always, there is a need for additional contacts to provide wider services to our clients.

There is also a need to add to and broaden the training of each officer in this Unit to enable them to better serve the needs of our probationers. We were very fortunate in that Dick King was able to attend a two-week drug training class offered by the Federal Drug Enforcement Agency in February at Irvine. With his newly acquired expertise, Dick is now able to supervise the probationers assigned to this Unit who have committed drug related offenses. It is quite clear that the other officers in this Unit would also benefit by additional training in various areas related to Probation Services.

NORTH COUNTY DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

By: Stanton H. Clift
Delinquency Prevention Officer

The year 1975 reflected a lessening of the number of requests from educators for help in solving school-related problems. Although alcohol abuse by students continued to present a very real problem as did truancy and incidents of vandalism, requests for assistance in solving on-campus problems diminished. It would appear that the reason for the reduction in the number of requests for assistance may very well be attributable to the activities of the School Attendance Review Boards (SARB) which got into full swing during 1975.

Although there was a reduction in the number of arrests for aid in solving school problems, at least from educators, 1975 saw a sharp rise in requests from individual parents for aid in preventing their children from engaging in delinquent behavior. Early in 1975 it became apparent that families in need of counseling with respect to parent-child relationships were more and more coming to rely on help from the Office of Delinquency Prevention. Referrals to the Delinquency Prevention Officer for help in solving family problems came from many sources, public and private. Approximately 20 family counseling sessions were held during the year.

In two respects, 1975 was a banner year for the North County Delinquency Prevention Office. First, with the opening of a new Adult Supervision Office in Santa Maria, the Delinquency Prevention Officer was able to move his office from the trunk of his car into a real office building complete with address and telephone number. Second, the Guadalupe Youth Service Center, sponsored by the Office of Delinquency Prevention of the Probation Department, was funded from County revenue sharing funds for the second full year. Both mid-year and end-of-year performance reports to the County Administrative Officer revealed that the Center had substantially met all goals set for 1974. Additionally, by getting those youth between the ages of 7 and 17 off the streets and occupied in worthwhile pursuits, incidents of juvenile delinquency were reduced by 85% in 1975 as indicated by police records.

As a member of the Juvenile Task Force, Regional Planning Board, Region P, Office of Criminal Justice Planning, the Delinquency Prevention Officer was engaged throughout 1975 in planning for the future. Membership in the Delinquency Prevention Officers' Association, Southern Region, allows this officer to keep in touch with planning and developments in the field of delinquency prevention throughout the State.

Membership in the Advisory Committee to the local office of the Employment Development Department, enables the writer to take an active role in planning and establishment of the annual Summer Youth Hire program administered through EDD, NYC and CETA. Some 400 young people are employed during the summer through this program in the North County alone. There are usually about 800 jobs available County-wide. Regular employment of youth during the summer school vacation period contributes immeasurably to a decrease in delinquency. During the expanded 10-week summer program of the Guadalupe Youth Service Center, there are usually 10-15 youth employed as Recreation Aides through NYC.

The Office of Delinquency Prevention is looking forward to 1976 in hopes of expanding prevention activities throughout the County. An eventual County-wide Youth Service System with the de-institutionalization of status offenders as a major goal is in our plans.

SOUTH COAST DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

By: Antony Chapman
Delinquency Prevention Officer

This year has been one of special significance to delinquency prevention. Federal and State interest in crime and delinquency prevention has been at an all time high. The ramifications of the Federal Delinquency Prevention Act are beginning to be felt. The need for more effective youth services planning surfaced at many different levels. The County Board of Supervisors initially appointed an advisory group to evaluate the need for a Juvenile Hall in the Santa Maria Valley, and then appointed a 37 member Juvenile Justice Master Plan Task Force to make recommendations regarding the prevention of delinquency and effective treatment of delinquents. The South Coast Coordinating Council initiated a youth needs survey. County Mental Health Coordinated and completed a survey of youth services. The Office of Criminal Justice Planning organized a Delinquency Prevention Task Force. All these activities have helped focus local attention on the problem.

In the first quarter of the year, this office sponsored a workshop on the Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974. The purpose was to inform citizens and agency personnel (about 150 attended) on the provisions of the law and the changes

which may result. An improved preparation for parenthood curriculum was developed in cooperation with local high school Family Living classes and the A.A.U.W. Assistance was provided local private organizations in developing revenue sharing grants for youth development projects. Support was given to the South Coast Coordinating Council and an ad-hoc County group promoting "Life Enrichment" as developed in the City of Davis. This coalition sponsored a community meeting to inform citizens of the possibilities inherent in the concept.

In the second quarter, planning assistance was provided to County Mental Health in organizing a youth services survey. A presentation was made to school social studies teachers about community resources available to assist them in presenting organizational services and helping keep youth out of trouble. Planning of youth summer activities for Boys' Clubs, Girls' Clubs, and Operation Kids was a major activity. The Office assisted in the planning and implementation of a Health Day at San Marcos High School. A youth alcohol survey was planned and implemented. A series of meetings was initiated in the Franklin Center with the objective of organizing and acquiring funds for a "Youth Service Center" to serve the area. In both elementary and high school, classes were given presentations on youth responsibility, shop lifting, vandalism, malicious mischief, and runaway situations. The Youth Advisory Board held its annual Family Workshop with over 100 youth and adults contributing to discussions of family relations.

Youth groups and youth activity programs were assisted during the summer months with both indirect consultation and speaking engagements. The Office contributed to the priority recommendations of the newly formed Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP) Prevention Task Force. Planning for the East Side "Youth Service Center" continued and a questionnaire on youth needs for and from agencies was developed.

The balance of the year included planning and coordinating the annual Youth and County Government program. This year for the first time, the students were able to meet in groups with their Supervisor (County Board of Supervisors) or his representatives and role play some decision making activities. Advice was given to the OCJP Board and OCJP Prevention Task Force regarding their 1976-77 funding plan. Assistance was again provided to local organizations in grant writing. The County's Juvenile Justice Master Plan Task Force met for the first time and developed an organizational structure. This Office is staffing both the Task Force as a whole and the Prevention Committee of the Task Force.

Coincidentally, the South Coast Coordinating Council is planning a "Youth Needs" survey. The two activities should prove complimentary and mutually beneficial.

Ongoing activities throughout the year include serving as executive secretary to the County's Juvenile Justice/ Delinquency Prevention Commission, serving as Vice-President of the Citizens' Council on Crime, participating in the Juvenile Officers Coordinating Council (J.O.C.C.) and assisting with Departmental staff and training meetings.

TRAINING OFFICER REPORT, 1975

By: William B. Schenk

In July, 1974, the position of Training Officer was added to the Probation Department.

That position was filled in November, 1974, under the agreement that the position was to be divided with approximately 75% of the officer's time directed to the Subsidy Unit of eight officers, and three clerical staff.

Seven months later, in July, 1975, an additional one half Subsidy Unit was added in Santa Maria, increasing the staff to eleven officers and four and one half clerical positions.

Since only 25% of the training effort could be directed at approximately seventy probation officers in the "line", there was a constant concern of how to best utilize the position. A fact finding file was begun and all available materials concerning training, manuals of procedure, memos and reports were compiled and evaluated.

Various agency manuals were inspected and other Probation Departments contacted in an effort to obtain the most current and relevant information available.

The first apparent need was to implement threshold training for nineteen newly hired Probation staff. The four one day and two half-day sessions from December, 1975, to January, 1976, included input from most of the Probation Department Administration Staff, and a majority of local agencies in the Criminal Justice System. Tours included Juvenile Hall, La Morada, Los Prietos Boys' Camp, Day Treatment Centers, Juvenile Court, and the County Jail. Some frustration was expressed by participants over the flury of classes which distracted from their busy schedules and Court deadlines.

The Training Officer next noted the urgent need for updated procedural manuals, and a Department Policy Manual. Several committees were formed and these manuals are in various stages of completion with the final due dates ranging from May to September, 1976. Such manuals will greatly aid in the unity of the Department procedures, and will be the subject matter of more formalized training.

Volunteer training sessions were held to recruit, train, and select certain volunteers to work with the Subsidy Officers. Six three hour sessions were held at the Subsidy Office in February and March, and again in October and November, 1975.

Participants included students, Aides, Intern Probation Officers, Probation Officers, Probationers, ex-offenders, and correctional staff from the Federal Correctional Institute in Lompoc. Films, video tapes, role playing, psychodrama and correctional counseling theory was presented by the Training Officer and staff through an inter-action learning process (I.L.P.). Formal training on both the Subsidy Unit level and the Department level has been a struggle.

Department training needs, training staff, and budget resources have been difficult for administration to bring together. New officers are hired to cover existing caseloads, and Supervisors are reluctant to release staff for training or teaching without some manpower compensation. Most of the training offered was on a "need to know" basis, or courses and seminars were screened by the Training Officer for release to the staff. Most of these were offered at one of the local Colleges or Universities, often for extension or certificate credit.

Department training by the Training Officer was initially involved in the video taping of various programs, counseling sessions, etc., and re-playing them for Unit discussion, etc.

As the Department manuals reach completion, there will be more scheduled classes on basic procedures for all officers on a more unified basis. Finally, when the long range needs for staff development, promotability and "career ladders" are more clearly defined, the demand and support for training will increase.

It is felt that future training will include more total staff participation as the value of training is realized by staff, and our clients as well.

PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

By: Jeanne Troth
Psychologist

The organization and structure of psychological services remains the same. Its sole reason for being is to make psychological assessments of those individuals referred by other divisions -- line, investigation, supervision and others. This year, as in the past, approximately 250 to 300 people, mostly juvenile, have been referred.

Still other factors appear also to remain constant. The "typical referral" is generally between 14 and 17 years of age and male. He is additionally either of Anglo or Mexican ancestry, (Blacks may constitute about 10%), and his parents are divorced or separated. Initially the individual came to the attention of this Department and subsequently became, or is in the process of being made, a ward of the Court due to problems centering either at home with his parents or in the community, specifically school truancy, petty theft, drugs, and alcohol.

While girls are referred slightly less frequently, they too fall in the same rough age bracket, 14 to 17 years, and came to the attention of Probation Services for much the same reasons. However, for girls at least, home problems seem to play a more significant role than specific difficulties with the community.

REHABILITATION SERVICES

LOS PRIETOS BOYS' CAMP
NOEL I. HANCOCK, SUPERINTENDENT

LA POSADA JUVENILE HALL
ELMO R. INNOCENTI, SUPERINTENDENT

LA MORADA GIRLS' RESIDENCE
FAITH W. RYAN, DIRECTOR

DAY CARE CENTERS
LARRY H. COY, DIRECTOR

LOS PRIETOS BOYS' CAMP

STAFF

Noel I. Hancock, Superintendent
Jack E. Davis, Assistant Superintendent
Albert L. Cobb, Group Counselor III
Albert J. Roberta, Group Counselor III
Mervin L. Aftergut, Group Counselor II
Richard S. Axilrod, Group Counselor II
Albert J. Bakun, Group Counselor II
Mendell E. Bish, Group Counselor II
Bernard J. Bol, Group Counselor II
Stephen W. Crigler, Group Counselor II
Charles P. Eckberg, Group Counselor II
William J. Jackson, Group Counselor II
Dane T. Jones, Group Counselor II
Thomas J. Mendoza, Group Counselor II
Thomas H. Murphy, Group Counselor II
Richard G. Starling, Group Counselor II
John T. Uliasz, Group Counselor II
Norman L. Holbrook, Group Counselor Night
Thomas R. Jordan, Group Counselor Night
Edward Martinez, Jr., Group Counselor Night
Russell C. Frith, Building Maintenance Leader
Carl H. Heidner, Building Maintenance Worker II
Bent E. Andersson, Chef
Rheba L. Davis, Cook, Detention Facility
Hazelle Frith, Account Clerk II

LOS PRIETOS BOYS' CAMP, 1975

by: Noel I. Hancock
Superintendent

Los Prietos Boys' Camp operates under the auspices of Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties to serve young male offenders committed from the Juvenile Courts under Section 601 and/or 602 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. The program provides opportunities for young men to redirect their lives toward more productive and appropriate behavior through counseling, academic training, and vocational instruction and experience. Emphasis is placed on the worth of the individual, with an effort toward improvement of self concept. Los Prietos is a twenty-four hour residential treatment program.

During the year just passed, continued increase in community exposure and involvement were experienced. The Camp fielded athletic teams in football, basketball, and track, enabling the young men to experience socially approved competitive experiences. These programs represent the first successful positive endeavors for some of the boys at Camp. Continued training experiences in work locations in, and around, the Santa Barbara community were used in an effort to train young men for work situations, and to provide opportunity to interrelate positively within normal societal levels.

Use of community volunteers in the Camp program has continued. Younger college involved students have become interested in visiting within the program, and taking part in recreation activities with campers. These people have proven to be helpful in providing wholesome models for association and identification. Volunteers are helpful in the program in providing one to one relationships which are not possible with the limitations of staff patterns and related duties.

Counseling programs have been strengthened by additional training for staff personnel, some accomplished upon self initiation and responsibility by the staff. Family counseling continues to be a strong part of the therapy program. Studies by family counselors and the Camp administration indicate that there is a larger probability of successful rehabilitation for boys attending family counseling, than for those who do not.

During the year 185 boys entered the Camp program (79 from Santa Barbara County). Sixteen boys were recommitted to the program after failure upon return home, with six of these from Santa Barbara County. The average daily attendance for the year was 72, with a 38.3 figure for Santa Barbara. The average length of stay for boys successfully completing the program was seven months and one week.

A notable shift from drug involvement to severe alcohol involvement was prevalent with the majority of the population. Consequently, two of the volunteer groups working in the program are from alcoholic problem oriented sources.

Staff personnel problems have been normal during the year. Two staff members received disability retirement, one for a heart condition and one for a job related injury. One staff member retired as a result of length of service. We have had difficulty in keeping younger staff, and minority persons. This appears to be attributed to the fact that they are able to advance to positions of increased financial remuneration elsewhere.

Building plans, and relocation plans, continue but were slowed down during the year when Ventura County served notice of intent to terminate the Bi-County operation agreement. This notice was made in July, to become effective as soon as acceptable agreement for termination is achieved. Most of the Camp Board of Directors effort has been expended toward this agreement, causing a virtual stand still in relocation plans. The geographical location (near the river and Camp ground, and the public road running through Camp) continues to be a major factor in camper misbehavior, although increased and effective patrolling afforded by the Sheriff's Department has resulted in a decrease in the incidents of trespass.

LA POSADA JUVENILE HALL STAFF

SUPERINTENDENT

Elmo R. Innocenti

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

Robert D. Pierce

SENIOR GROUP COUNSELORS

Al-Theda Briley
Charles A. Beltran
Fred G. Soria

GROUP COUNSELORS

Robert Calderon
Gregory A. Gilliland
Helen F. Godden
Raymond Knight
Jeffrey Lewis
Ann McMullen
James Minas
James Murr
Roy New
John Ortegel
Agustin Rapanut
Carmen Rios
Oriette Schaider
Robert Waldron
Lynn Walker
Lynn Watts

INTAKE COUNSELORS

Darlene Brisby
Susan Hazard

FOOD SERVICE

Perfecto Morales, Chef
Antonio Marquez
Timothy Carrick

PRINCIPAL CLERK

C. La Vaun Eve

BUILDING MAINTENANCE LEADER

Louie Angeli

ACADEMIC STAFF

Robert A. Forslund, Principal
Julian Voorhees
Frank Arndt
James Hargrove

MEDICAL STAFF

Charles W. Owen M.D.
Gertrude Catherina R.N.

LA POSADA JUVENILE HALL ANNUAL REPORT

By: Elmo R. Innocenti
Superintendent

By elevating and refining the milieu of Santa Barbara County Juvenile Hall, one can note the many innovative modifications of the facility itself. Alterations have been made, new policies have been enacted, the expansion of the Juvenile Hall system within Santa Barbara County is occurring. All these methods and activities have been inaugurated to insure that positive change parallels societal need. Thus the administration envisions a situation in which the juvenile offender receives the maximum benefit from an unfortunate involvement with the law.

First of all, the physical changes within the institution have been inspired with the design of stimulating mental awareness of the individual. Murals have been created and painted within the residence halls and cafeteria with the anticipation of manufacturing a more residential situation. All the rooms have been painted with bright lively colors where the children are encouraged to use poster paint to fashion personal designs and narratives in their respective rooms. This concept is applying the difficult notion of including the individual detainee with the facility itself; for by painting his room, the detainee may be more peaceful with himself. The various activity rooms have also been painted and beautiful carpeting has been placed throughout many areas of the building. The setting of Juvenile Hall is one of an industriously new progressive outlook. Furthermore, the Hall has acquired a new color television set, a popcorn machine, and the student library in the Co-ed Residence Hall where most of the activities occur. Concurrently, Co-ed programming is constantly changing in order for a detainee to observe many viewpoints. One must consider the definition of Juvenile Hall and then realize that this County Administrative Office is responding to the California State definition of a Juvenile Hall by incorporating these new acquisitions and programs for a residential setting of quality.

Furthermore, Probation Officers have been assigned to Juvenile Hall after normal working hours and on weekends providing maximum service to the community and the Probation Department itself. This new program enables the out-of-control youth to be released as quickly as is feasible to minimize contact with the more troubled youth of our Community. Other new policies include having short periods of commitment, for youthful lawbreakers, to this detention facility by Juvenile Courts, thereby avoiding longer commitments at other types of facilities. Both of these new programs have been exceedingly successful in moving the detained youth back into society at a much swifter rate to insure against unreasonably prolonged contact with legal authorities.

As for new staff, Mr. Perfecto Morales and Mr. Antonio Marquez have been employed within the last year as Chef and Cook respectively. These gentlemen provide a wealth of variety in foods from differing cultures. Furthermore, from Santa Barbara City College come several young people who are working on an intern basis with the regular staff in direction. These young people creatively contribute new ideas for regular staff to consider. Above all, the entire program is becoming more sophisticated and varied to promote cross cultural stimulous and sensitivity which creates a more humane atmosphere. A controlled ethos of regularly balanced meals with more intensified counseling from volunteers and student interns seems to produce a more congenial and harmonious interworking relationship among the people within that facility.

Paralleling the upgrading of the facility in general, is the effective pursuit of safety features. The training of several staff in First Aid and Personal Safety produces an ever increasing safety program at Juvenile Hall. New smoke sensing devices have been placed throughout the facility to insure against fire which could lead to a serious injury. Moreover, a new intercommunications device has been installed to replace the old one. This new device is much more sensitive and therefore promotes a better safety factor for the line staff who may need assistance. These devices are essential to the smooth flowing operation of the Juvenile Hall system developed over the years. The next safety feature which Juvenile Hall hopes to acquire is a cover for the swimming pool. Finally, many staff have taken classes in First Aid and Personal Safety with the emphasis on the care of individuals who are in need of immediate medical treatment. This First Aid course will be a necessary requirement of all Juvenile Hall employees at a later date. The reasons for having knowledgeable persons in the area of First Aid could be critical within a detention facility.

In addition, the long awaited expansion of the Juvenile Hall facility in the North County area in the town of Orcutt has finally begun. The facility will house perhaps twenty of the minor offenders in that area. This new institution may be completed as early as November of 1976. The notion and working principle behind the facility exists primarily for the North County out-of-control youngster. Nevertheless the guiding attitude maintains that several small facilities are preferable to allowing any single juvenile facility to become so greatly enlarged that it is unmanageable and uncomfortable. This house of detention will be located next to the Santa Maria Sheriff's Sub-Station where the youngster will also find the Juvenile Court. This will streamline all processes for the heavy Court loads that occur during our modern times.

In conclusion, many positive changes have been made this year. For one, the tension within the facility has greatly diminished. Another is that there have been no incidents of youngsters running away from the facility within the last seventeen months. These examples expose the reasoning and the ideal motivation for the policies dispensed. A smooth operation is one of temperance which allows for very little confrontation. This is initiated by external stimulous and rational programs which do not afford any severe boredom or depression. Among the young these areas are the ones most difficult to deal with, for these persons may need constant supervision in order to keep them out of mischief. Concurrently, the Probation system may observe positive responses from the probationers and detainees within the facility itself.

STATISTICS

Year	Child Care Days	Admissions	Average Daily Population
1972	16,144	2,003	44.4
1973	17,344	1,960	47.5
1974	17,839	1,966	48.8
1975	16,196	1,896	44.2

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS

	Lowest	Highest
ADA	Dec. 24.8	March 59.0
Admissions	Dec. 116	July 196
Child Care Days	Dec. 768	June 1572

(Although population remained constant in comparison with other years for most of the prior years, we experienced the lowest population totals in December in a 14 year period.)

LA POSADA SCHOOL ANNUAL REPORT

This year has been one of positive change in many regards. New study carrels provide privacy for students to pursue their individualized assignments with a minimum of distraction.

The addition of wall-to-wall carpeting has reduced the sound level, and new bulletin boards and the rearrangement of furniture has provided a warmer environment more conducive to learning.

Newly added individualized materials and equipment has made available more opportunities to meet the special needs of more students.

LA MORADA STAFF AS OF DECEMBER, 1975

DIRECTOR

Faith W. Ryan

SENIOR GROUP COUNSELOR

Ann R. Poulson

GROUP COUNSELORS

Oleta Bennett
Patricia Hanna
Patricia Jackson
Betty L. Pond
Sandra Rhodes

RESIDENCE FOR TEEN-AGE GIRLS, INC.

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Mr. Graham Nash
President

Mrs. J. Kenneth Patterson
First Vice President

Mrs. Harold Case
Second Vice President

Mrs. James Cushman
Corresponding Secretary

Mrs. Theodore Roche, Jr.
Treasurer

Mrs. Carl Engel
Liaison Chairman
North County

LA MORADA - 1975

By: Faith W. Ryan
Director

Over the years, the most encouraging aspect of the functioning of the La Morada Residence is the steady development of resources made available to the residents, and the program's ability to exploit these resources for the betterment of the residents. There have been considerable changes since La Morada opened its doors twelve and a half years ago. The program has undergone fundamental revision with the adoption of the level system, the introduction of family counseling and the assumption by La Morada of home supervision for our graduates and probation services. The summer program expanded with the resource of the Neighborhood Youth Corp providing jobs and work experience for our residents.

Last year continued this trend with new added resources and alternatives being offered our residents in the school situation. School is a very important part of the La Morada program. The majority of our residents are ninth or tenth graders and most have serious truancy problems. Most of our residents, although of better than adequate mental ability, come to us as school failures. Our younger girls attend La Colina Junior High and our older girls, San Marcos High School. For several years, we have not allowed any of our residents to attend continuation school. This meant that the only schooling available for our residents was the regular academic public school. Over the years, this has provided us with many difficulties in spite of the exceptional aid offered to us by the schools involved. The first relief to this problem came with the addition of Title I education funding which provided us with tutors to help the residents during study hours with their individual learning deficiencies.

This past year saw a tremendous growth in the educational resources now available for our residents. First, several of our younger girls were placed in Opportunity School at La Colina. This is a special, one teacher, supportive classroom situation for Junior High students who have difficulty in handling the more sophisticated demands of a large school involving many teachers and changing classrooms. Our girls are emotionally and socially very immature and the benefits of this environment were immediately apparent. Secondly, we have added the resource of the Villa Esperanza School. Two of our residents in the past year attended the Villa. For our San Marcos girls, who are unable to handle the responsibility of going out to school, we expanded our Title I so that under San Marcos supervision they could be completely tutored in the residence until they are adjusted into the La Morada program. Two

residents received this type of tutoring during the fall semester. Another development was the establishment of vocational training at San Marcos. This will be very valuable for our older residents soon to move into adult status. We now have one girl, soon to be eighteen, registered in this course this spring. Finally, to our added benefit, San Marcos opened an Opportunity School on their campus with the beginning of this spring semester providing yet another resource for our residents.

So that the goals and standards of the program will be maintained, yet still allowing our residents to have specialized supportive schooling when needed, we have established within our level system the demand that all residents in order to graduate must be in regular school. Any resident in specialized school may only attain Level III. This means that when a resident is comfortable in this less demanding school situation, they will not be content to simply remain there, but will make the added effort to work their way back into normal school. We are very enthusiastic regarding all these resources now available to us in working in this major area, school, with our residents. We look to more changes in the future, particularly the effect on the La Morada program that will result from the new rule allowing sixteen year olds to receive High School diplomas by examination. Surely we can anticipate a constantly changing environment and we will make every effort to adapt the program to the constantly changing needs.

Within the Residence, we continued to structure according to our level system and we continue to be pleased with the advantages of acting as probation officer for our La Morada graduates. It was a stable year as can be seen by the lower than usual number of admissions.

During the summer, we had almost three separate programs in progress. The resource of jobs under the Neighborhood Youth Corp was limited to youth over 16 years of age. Only four of our residents qualified and were able to be employed. Two worked at the Goleta Girls' Club, one with the Hollister School summer program and one at U.C.S.B. Since summer school was available, on a voluntary basis, residents could attend summer school. Three elected to go to school, and for those remaining within the Residence, we developed a structured schedule of such things as craft classes, sewing lessons, calisthenics and field trips. Responsibility was required for all girls regardless of which program they chose. As an incentive, a trip to Magic Mountain was offered as a reward for excellent performance. To our amazement, every resident qualified.

1975 did see some staff changes. Two of our counselors, Judy Ramirez and Madonna Searing resigned to devote their full time to graduate school. Betty Pond and Patricia Hanna have joined our staff as replacements and we are pleased to have them working with us.

One area in which there was no change was in the marvelous support given to La Morada by the Residence for Teenage Girls, Inc. All of our major activities were made possible through the generosity of the Board. This included our trip to Universal Studio during the spring vacation, Magic Mountain and Disneyland in the summer and the Rancho Oso breakfast ride during Christmas vacation. Throughout the year, the Board helped us observe each resident's birthday and graduation by furnishing a special cake and gift for each event. Our Christmas tea this year was held on December 11, and we thank our many friends who helped in making the Residence beautiful and the tea a success. Our final party of the year was our Christmas party for the residents with Santa Claus and gifts given by the Board and people in the community. Our residence was closed from Christmas Eve to the day after Christmas allowing all of our girls to spend Christmas Day with their families or in homes graciously opened to them.

In addition to making available the funds for our various activities, we also are grateful to the many people who have given their time to La Morada. We are especially in debt to those who solved our La Colina transportation problem now that school buses are no longer available. Mr. Graham Nash, the Board President, spent many, many hours with us, ever supportive to staff and residents alike. This year too saw a major contribution by the Board to the physical plant with the construction of a much needed ample storeroom built by our carport.

From the administrative aspect, we wish also to thank the many individuals of the Santa Barbara City Schools and the Probation Department for helping us in the functioning of the program, particularly Mr. Harrington, Assistant Chief Probation Officer. Last year was surely a "good" year. Our residence was permanently improved with the addition of the storeroom, our community resources expanded for the enrichment of the program, and we continued to benefit from the support of the community.

DAY CARE TREATMENT CENTERS, 1975

SANTA BARBARA	LOMPOC	SANTA MARIA
VILLA ESPERANZA	CASA FLORAL	CAMINO SEGUNDO

STAFF

Lawrence H. Coy, Director

VILLA ESPERANZA

Mary Ellen Pawlowski
Senior Probation Officer

Bret Harney
Assistant Probation Officer

Margaret Ashford
Clerk Typist II

CASA FLORAL

Donald Farmer
Senior Probation Officer

Kathy Congleton
Assistant Probation Officer

Billie Jo Andrew
Clerk Typist II

CAMINO SEGUNDO

Craig Hamlin
Senior Probation Officer

Penny Johnson
Assistant Probation Officer

Dixie Cooksey
Clerk Typist II

INTRODUCTION

Although the Santa Barbara County Probation Department has various resources for meeting the needs of its Court wards, there has been a lack of adequate programming to deal with the type of juvenile who does not need a closed residential setting, but is in need of an intensive-comprehensive treatment approach to working with his problems on a daily basis. The Day Care Treatment Centers have been established to service Court wards by way of meeting their needs while they remain living with their own families or foster families.

The Day Care Treatment Centers provide specialized counseling, schooling, supervision, and coordinate community resources for wards who are experiencing difficult adjustment problems in their daily life. Programming reflects an individual, social, and educational approach, providing a meaningful and relevant treatment alternative to 24-hour institutional residency. Typical behavioral problems of wards are patterns of runaway, school maladjustment, academic failures, rebellion, drug abuse, and law offending.

The Centers operate with the understanding that Juvenile Court wards are best off remaining with their own families, or at least in their own community in foster care, whenever possible. In the past, juveniles have been placed into institutions for certain kinds of behavior; however, the Centers' intentions are to work with some of those juveniles whose behavior and attitude bring them into conflict at home, school, and in the community without posing serious threats to themselves or society.

In order to best work toward keeping a juvenile from being placed into a 24-hour institution, it is necessary that the youth and family recognize that problems do exist, and cooperate with Center staff in working out those problems. How long a ward participates in the Center program depends upon the amount of the following characteristics he/she demonstrates over an open-ended period of time as evaluated by staff, parent(s), peers, and ward:

1. Responsibility in decisions and related behavior.
2. Awareness of other people's feelings.
3. Courtesy.
4. Respect for persons and property.
5. Cooperation.

The actual time of participation for a ward in the Center program averages approximately one year, but may be as short as three to four months. While academics are important to each student, the Center is a counseling program first and an academic program second. The Probation Officer is present to counsel children and parents about their problems, help establish realistic expectations, and enforce the follow-through of behavior to coincide with those expectations.

All wards must go through a screening process prior to commitment to the Center by the Court. The screening committee consists of at least one Center Probation Officer and one Center teacher. To date, no ward has been returned to the Center by the Court contrary to the recommendations of Center staff.

SCHOOLING:

Each Center has one credentialed teacher and a teacher's aide, sometimes also credentialed. Additional services provided on a rotating basis between Centers are those of a Small Group Specialist (reading, testing, group and individual counseling); two Career/Vocational Specialists; and a Principal. School staff consults with probation staff on a very regular, intensive basis regarding new referrals, on-going case work, and graduation/releases.

Each student's past school record is evaluated and a specialized program of instruction and counseling is assigned; students receive academic credits in accordance with all district public schools. Emphasis is placed upon academic remediation, vocational/career orientation, and work experience. Development of special interests (hobbies, talents, creativity) is used as a motivational incentive.

PROBATION STAFF:

One experienced Probation Officer supervises two-thirds of the wards and a Senior Probation Officer, Officer-in-Charge, supervises the remaining one-third, in addition to handling limited Center administrative duties. The Director of the Centers travels between Centers consulting staff and supervising in personnel and program matters and is responsible for all budgetary and general administrative concerns.

VOLUNTEERS:

In addition to the probation and teaching staff, college students and other interested persons act in an auxiliary capacity to provide special interests for wards and provide support. Parents also are encouraged to contribute their time and special talents whenever appropriate.

TERMINATIONS/RELEASES:

Each ward is evaluated on a period-by-period, day-by-day, and weekly basis by all staff. Program graduations, as determined by all staff, are generally set to coincide with public school semester breaks. Wards who outright "fail to adjust" to the Center program are returned to Court for alternative disposition.

After being graduated from the Center daily program, students continue on probation for a period of a few months under the supervision of their Center Probation Officer, following which time they may be terminated from wardship. Wards who "fail to adjust" on furlough may be returned to the daily program upon staff determination and order of the Probation Officer.

If a ward has successfully completed the Center program (daily and furlough portions), he/she may be terminated from Court wardship or placed on regular probation with a lesser degree of supervision.

COUNSELING:

Peer pressure is often utilized in Center programming as perhaps the best form of individual ward control and insight development. Therefore, Peer Group Counseling is accentuated in the program and each ward is obligated to attend a minimum of two hours of formal group counseling per week and, occasionally, as many as six hours weekly. Informal peer groups occur each morning and afternoon as well as at other assigned times throughout the week.

Family Group Counseling occurs on a semi-regular basis in the evening and may be of a three to six months duration. Individual counseling occurs on an intensive basis for most wards in the daily program and also during "furlough" status for a three to six month period following release. Often a ward's counseling goals are furthered, in cooperation with the teaching staff, by the school assignment of related readings and community investigations.

SUMMARY:

A major dynamic of the Center program is the periodic re-ordering of program priorities to coincide with a changing population typology; such change reflects the concept that "the glove, program, must fit the hand, student" in order to avoid irrelevant institutional program designs.

The foregoing information reflects the more generalized program concepts that are constant in all Centers. However, within each Center there are many program variations which exist to most effectively seek out "success" through the applications of the strengths that both students and staff bring with them to the Center.

STATISTICS

JUVENILE

ADULT

ADULT

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, ADULT DIVISION	Pages	48-49
SUPERIOR COURT STATISTICS (From State)	"	50-53
LOWER COURT STATISTICS (From State)	"	54-57

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, ADULT DIVISION, 1975

INTAKE AND INVESTIGATION:

Formal Investigations -----	1145	
Courtesy and Interstate ---	89	
O/R and Bail Reduction ----	1260	
Out of Town Investigation -	75	
Total for year ----------		2569
Total last year to date ---------		3169

SUMMARY GRANTS:

Total for year ----------	2470
Total last year to date ---------	2245

PAROLE INVESTIGATIONS:

Total for year ----------	101
Total last year to date ---------	100

Completed Adult Court Reports:

Santa Barbara ----------	773	
Santa Maria ----------	481	
Lompoc ----------	227	
Total ----------		1481
Last year ------		1790

Completed Adult Supplemental Reports:

Santa Barbara ----------	1438	
Santa Maria ----------	1282	
Lompoc ----------	301	
Special Supervision ----------	175	
Total ----------		3196
Last year ------		2442

SUPERVISION CASES: (Average per month)

Formal cases under active supervision from Superior Courts:

Santa Barbara	372	
Santa Maria	302	
Lompoc	119	
Special Supervision	174	
Total		967

Formal cases under active supervision from Municipal Courts:

Santa Barbara	283	
Santa Maria	263	
Lompoc	215	
Special Supervision	3	
Total		764

Formal cases under active supervision from Justice Courts:

Santa Barbara	27	
Santa Maria	19	
Lompoc	223	
Total		269

Cases being supervised for another State:

Santa Barbara	14	
Santa Maria	10	
Lompoc	7	31

Cases being supervised for another County:

Santa Barbara	61		
Santa Maria	36		
Lompoc	17	114	
Total for both			145

Parolees under supervision:

Santa Barbara	7	
Santa Maria	4	
Lompoc	2	
Total		13

Summary cases under supervision:

Santa Barbara	2856	
Santa Maria	638	
Lompoc	47	
Total		3541

Diversion cases under supervision:

Santa Barbara	165	
Santa Maria	69	
Lompoc	30	
Total		264

TOTAL NUMBER OF ADULTS BEING SUPERVISED PER MONTH -- 5963
TOTAL NUMBER OF ADULTS BEING SUPERVISED LAST YEAR -- 5844

PERSONS ON PROBATION TO SUPERIOR COURT DECEMBER 30, 1975:			
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Homicide	4	2	6
Robbery	35	1	36
Assault	84	3	87
Burglary	133	16	149
Theft	118	31	149
Auto Theft	20	0	20
Forgery	65	24	89
Sex	36	1	37
Marijuana	127	11	138
Dangerous Drugs	24	6	30
Other	121	25	146
TOTALS:	767	120	887

SUPERIOR COURT

CONVICTED OFFENSE FOR ADULTS PLACED ON PROBATION:

	1974	1975
Manslaughter	1	0
Manslaughter (vehicle)	0	1
Robbery	10	16
Assault	39	22
Burglary	54	37
Theft (except auto)	36	19
Auto Theft	11	5
Fraud	13	3
Receiving Stolen Property	18	15
Forgery and Checks	29	18
Rape	1	6
Lewd Acts with a Child	5	3
Other Sex Offenses	5	3
Drug Laws	144	53
Deadly Weapons	3	2
Drunk Driving	4	4
Failure to Render Aid	2	3
Escape	1	0
Bookmaking	4	0
Disturbing the Peace	1	0
Malicious Mischief	1	0
Contributing	1	1
All Other Offenses	8	10
TOTAL	391	221

SEX AND RACE OF ADULTS PLACED ON PROBATION:

		1974	1975
MALE:	White	270	122
	Mexican-American	47	39
	Negro	24	18
	American Indian	1	0
	Oriental	0	2
	Other	2	2
	Unknown	2	0
FEMALE:	White	36	28
	Mexican-American	5	4
	Negro	3	6
	Oriental	1	0
	TOTAL	391	221

AGE OF ADULTS PLACED ON PROBATION:

	1974	1975
Under 20	50	30
20-24	156	84
25-29	85	40
30-34	41	25
35-39	20	17
40-44	6	8
45-49	9	11
50 and over	24	6
TOTAL	391	221

TERM OF PROBATION IMPOSED ON ADULTS:

	1974	1975
One year but less than two	3	10
Two years but less than three	28	4
Three years but less than four	267	109
Four years but less than five	0	1
Five years but less than six	93	97
TOTAL	391	221

JAIL TERM IMPOSED AS A CONDITION OF PROBATION:

	1974	1975
Placed on probation with no jail	163	69
Less than three months	69	40
Three months to six months	49	32
Six months to nine months	48	36
Nine months to one year	6	8
One year or more	56	36
TOTAL	391	221

TYPE OF REMOVAL OF PERSONS FROM PROBATION:

	1974	1975
Probation terminated	248	282
Absconded	11	32
Probation revoked - prison	21	14
Probation revoked - jail	14	7
Probation revoked--not sentenced	22	20
Probation revoked - dismissed	19	55
Probation revoked - sent to CRC	11	3
Other type of removal	29	12
TOTAL	375	425

REMOVALS FROM PROBATION BY TYPE AND CONVICTED OFFENSE						
CONVICTED OFFENSE	Totals	Terminated	Abscond	Technical Violations	Offenses	Misc.
Homicide	2	2	0	0	0	0
Robbery	9	7	1	0	1	0
Assault	43	30	4	0	8	1
Burglary	54	29	4	3	17	1
Theft (except auto)	52	27	5	4	14	2
Auto Theft	14	6	2	1	5	0
Forgery and Checks	46	22	10	0	12	2
Sex	20	15	0	1	3	1
Marijuana	94	76	4	4	8	2
Drugs	68	48	2	4	11	3
Other	23	20	0	1	2	0
TOTALS:	425	282	32	18	81	12

REMOVALS FROM PROBATION BY TYPE AND MONTH						
MONTHS SUPERVISED	Totals	Terminated	Abscond	Technical Violations	Offenses	Misc.
00-5	22	1	1	2	6	12
6-11	15	3	1	2	9	0
12-17	52	29	5	0	18	0
18-23	74	56	5	3	10	0
24-27	48	32	2	4	10	0
30-35	60	31	9	3	17	0
36-47	112	96	4	4	9	0
48-59	22	17	4	0	1	0
60 or more	20	17	1	1	1	0
TOTALS:	425	282	32	18	81	2

LOWER COURT

CONVICTED OFFENSE FOR ADULTS PLACED ON PROBATION:

	1974	1975
Manslaughter	0	1
Vehicular Manslaughter	2	0
Robbery	0	2
Assault	107	162
Burglary	31	60
Theft (except auto)	144	227
Auto Theft	13	22
Fraud	37	72
Receiving Stolen Property	20	35
Forgery and Checks	45	55
Rape	1	1
Other Sex Offenses	8	7
Drug Laws	79	58
Deadly Weapons	14	16
Drunk Driving	1544	1596
Failure to Render Aid	14	19
Escape	0	1
Bookmaking	0	2
Non-support	24	20
Disturbing the Peace	82	89
Liquor Violations	6	10
Malicious Mischief	19	37
Contributing	6	7
Disorderly Conduct	7	8
Unemployment Insurance	9	4
City-County Ordinance	13	9
All Other	284	530
TOTAL	2509	3050

SEX AND RACE OF ADULTS PLACED ON PROBATION:

		1974	1975
MALE:	White	1582	1861
	Mexican-American	431	542
	Negro	91	127
	American-Indian	3	7
	Oriental	5	5
	Other	2	10
	Unknown	9	7
FEMALE:	White	307	376
	Mexican-American	56	83
	Negro	20	29
	American-Indian	1	0
	Oriental	0	1
	Other	1	1
	Unknown	1	1
	TOTAL	2509	3050

AGE OF ADULTS PLACED ON PROBATION:

	1974	1975
Under 20	191	274
20-24	634	814
25-29	451	554
30-34	279	308
35-39	234	224
40-44	189	203
45-49	183	204
50 and over	348	469
TOTAL	2509	3050

TERM OF PROBATION IMPOSED ON ADULTS:

	1974	1975
Under one year	80	350
One year but less than two	549	833
Two years but less than three	1583	1475
Three years but less than four	297	383
Five years but less than six	0	9
TOTAL	2509	3050

JAIL TERM IMPOSED AS A CONDITION OF PROBATION:

	1974	1975
Placed on Probation with no jail	2133	2577
Less than three months	352	444
Three months to six months	12	16
Six months to nine months	6	8
Nine months to one year	1	0
One year or more	5	5
TOTAL	2509	3050

TYPE OF REMOVAL OF PERSONS FROM PROBATION:

	1974	1975
Probation terminated	1086	1875
Absconded	26	90
Probation revoked - prison	3	3
Probation revoked - jail	137	43
Probation revoked - not sentenced	89	78
Probation revoked - dismissed	138	279
Other type of removal	12	12
TOTAL	1491	2380

REMOVALS FROM PROBATION BY TYPE AND CONVICTED OFFENSE						
CONVICTED OFFENSE	Totals	Terminated	Abscond	Technical Violations	Offenses	Misc.
Homicide	1	1	0	0	0	0
Assault	97	72	2	5	16	2
Burglary	30	22	1	1	6	0
Theft (except auto)	207	160	7	7	31	2
Auto Theft	15	8	3	0	4	0
Forgery and Checks	45	27	3	2	13	0
Sex Offenses	23	21	0	0	2	0
Drug Law Violations	27	17	1	1	8	0
Marijuana	40	31	1	1	7	0
Other	1,895	1,516	72	50	249	8
TOTALS:	2,380	1,875	90	67	336	12

REMOVALS FROM PROBATION BY TYPE AND MONTH						
MONTHS SUPERVISED	Totals	Terminated	Abscond	Technical Violations	Offenses	Misc.
0-05	364	171	26	13	142	12
6-11	273	144	30	20	79	0
12-17	429	356	12	11	50	0
18-23	188	124	16	16	32	0
24-27	939	923	1	2	13	0
30-35	62	41	3	5	13	0
36-47	105	100	1	0	4	0
48-59	8	5	0	0	3	0
60 or more	12	11	1	0	0	0
TOTALS:	2,380	1,875	90	67	336	12

PERSONS ON PROBATION TO LOWER COURTS DECEMBER 30, 1975:			
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Homicide	4	1	5
Robbery	3	0	3
Assault	197	26	223
Burglary	75	9	84
Theft	215	177	392
Auto Theft	28	1	29
Forgery	45	34	79
Sex	31	1	32
Marijuana	64	13	77
Dangerous Drugs	31	7	38
Other	3206	496	3702
TOTALS:	3899	765	4664

JUVENILE

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY	Pages	58
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, JUVENILE DIVISION	"	59-61
REMOVALS	"	62-69
DISPOSITIONS	"	70-72
SUBSEQUENT DELINQUENCY	"	73-74
INITIAL REFERRALS	"	75-78

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY IN SANTA BARBARA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

For the Period Ending December 31, 1975

	Total	Boys	Girls
INITIAL REFERRALS			
Delinquents	2092	1467	625
Closed at intake	927	619	308
Placed under informal		439	177
Petitions filed during period	549	409	140
Court dispositions during period	610	461	149
Transferred other county	35	30	5
Closed, discharged	111	84	27
Probation as non-ward	115	92	23
Declared ward	338	246	92
Remand to adult court	6	4	2
Committed to CYA	5	5	-
SUBSEQUENT PETITION FILED (RE-REFERRALS)			
Delinquency petitions	445	324	121
Multiple petitions	--	--	--
Dismissed or transferred	32	22	10
Remand to adult court	5	5	-
Prior status formal or 725-a maintained	386	277	109
Formal status initiated	6	5	1
Initial CYA commitment	10	9	1
Recommitted to CYA	4	4	-
Turned back to CYA	2	2	-
INFORMAL STATUS			
Cases added from intake	616	439	177
Cases removed by petition filing	73	49	24
Cases terminated	503	379	124
Count at end of period	408	279	129
725-A STATUS (PROBATION WITHOUT WARDSHIP)			
Cases added from petition pending status	115	92	23
Cases assigned to formal probation	6	5	1
Cases terminated	81	68	13
Count at end of period	74	57	17
FORMAL STATUS			
Cases added from petition pending status	338	246	92
Cases added from 725-a status	6	5	1
Cases added by revocation from CYA	-	-	-
Cases committed to CYA	10	9	1
Other cases terminated	292	217	75
Count at end of period	716	485	231
TOTAL CASES IN SUPERVISION STATUS	1198	821	377
PENDING COURT	99	66	33

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, JUVENILE DIVISION, 1975

REFERRALS:

Formal	585	
Informal	640	
Closed at Investigation	1230	
Conferences	2523	
Referred other Agencies	299	
Out-of-town Investigations	59	
Traffic Hearings	4691	
Military Checks	304	
Total for Year		10,331
Total last Year		10,715

INVESTIGATIONS:

Number of new petitions filed this year:

	601	602	Total	
Santa Barbara	273	66	339	
Santa Maria	135	44	179	
Lompoc	73	53	126	
Total for Year				644
Total last Year				689

Number of new active petitions filed this year:

Santa Barbara	240	10	250	
Santa Maria	91	3	94	
Lompoc	56	10	66	
Total for Year				410
Total last Year				437

Number of supplemental petitions filed this year:

Santa Barbara	39	37	76	
Santa Maria	34	23	57	
Lompoc	4	3	7	
Total for Year				140
Total last Year				176

PLACED ON INFORMAL PROBATION AND DIVERSION:

Santa Barbara	426	
Santa Maria	125	
Lompoc	139	
Total for Year		690
Total last Year		698

REPORTS COMPLETED:

Juvenile Court Reports:

Santa Barbara	292	
Santa Maria	142	
Lompoc	122	
Total		556

New Active Court Reports:

Santa Barbara	8	
Santa Maria	60	
Lompoc	60	
Special Supervision	28	
Day Care Centers	5	
La Morada	9	
Total		170

Supplemental Court Reports:

Santa Barbara	203	
Santa Maria	87	
Lompoc	29	
Special Supervision	16	
Day Care Centers	14	
La Morada	24	
Total		373

Oral Reports:

Santa Barbara	25	
Santa Maria	28	
Lompoc	8	
Special Supervision	18	
Day Care Centers	7	
La Morada	1	
Total		87

CONFERENCES HELD:

Santa Barbara	1595	
Santa Maria	505	
Lompoc	452	
Total		2552

TRAFFIC HEARINGS HELD:

Santa Barbara	2326	
Santa Maria	1619	
Lompoc	798	
Total		4743

SPECIAL SERVICES

Psychological reports completed	256
Stepparent adoptions completed	197
Abandonment proceedings completed	17
Child Custody investigations completed	99
Sealings completed	180
Military checks completed	304
Marriage clearances completed	181

PLACEMENTS

Foster home placements during year	83	
Number of minors in foster homes at end of year		68
Institutional placements during year	36	
Number of minors in institutions at end of year		77
Committed to Los Prietos during year	86	
Number of wards in Los Prietos at end of year		39
La Morada placements during year	20	
Number of wards in La Morada at end of year		13
Committed to Youth Authority during year	16	
Number of wards in Youth Authority at end of year		23
TOTAL NUMBER OF PLACEMENTS AT END OF YEAR		220

SUPERVISION

Wards under active supervision (average per month):

Santa Barbara	323	
Santa Maria	161	
Lompoc	129	
Special Supervision	93	
La Morada	19	
Day Care Center	41	
TOTAL		766

Informal cases under active supervision:

Santa Barbara	195	
Santa Maria	72	
Lompoc	76	
TOTAL		343

Awaiting disposition:

Santa Barbara	121	
Santa Maria	45	
Lompoc	39	
Special Supervision	4	
Day Care Centers	1	
La Morada	1	
TOTAL		211

TOTAL AVERAGE NUMBER OF JUVENILE CASES BEING SUPERVISED PER MONTH---------- 1320

REMOVALS OF DELINQUENT BOYS FROM FORMAL STATUS

OFFENSE	MONTHS UNDER SUPERVISION											
	TOTAL	0-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	16-18	19-21	22-24	25-30	31-36	37 or more
Robbery	6	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	0
Assault	18	0	0	0	2	5	2	2	4	0	0	3
Burglary	35	2	2	4	7	4	3	4	1	1	4	2
Theft, Fraud	17	1	5	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	1	3
Auto Theft	9	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	3	0	1
Forgery	6	0	1	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Rape, Forcible	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Sex Offenses	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0
Marijuana	22	2	2	1	3	4	2	3	1	1	1	2
Other Drugs	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Drunk Driving, Hit and Run	10	0	0	1	2	3	1	0	1	1	0	0
Other Specifics	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3
Incorrigible	25	2	5	1	2	2	4	3	1	1	0	3
Malicious Mischief	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Liquor Offenses	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0
Gas, Glue Sniffing	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Loitering, Curfew, Trespassing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly Conduct	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Truancy	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1
Runaway, Transient	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Runaway, Other	37	2	1	2	1	8	5	3	1	7	2	5
Traffic	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	226	9	18	12	29	37	26	22	15	23	12	23

REMOVALS OF DELINQUENT GIRLS FROM FORMAL STATUS

	MONTHS UNDER SUPERVISION											
	TOTAL	0-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	16-18	19-21	22-24	25-30	31-36	37 or more
Assault	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Theft, Fraud	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1
Auto Theft	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Forgery	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Dangerous Drugs	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Incorrigible	26	1	1	0	3	3	6	4	1	4	1	2
Liquor Offenses	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Truancy	8	0	1	0	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	1
Runaway, Transient	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
Runaway Other	24	0	0	4	1	2	3	1	2	3	5	3

REMOVAL OF DELINQUENTS FROM FORMAL STATUS

BY RACE AND AGE

AGE	MONTHS UNDER SUPERVISION											
	0-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	16-18	19-21	22-24	25-30	31-36	37 or more	TOTAL
BOYS:												
8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
13	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
14	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
15	0	3	0	1	3	2	0	0	1	0	1	11
16	3	2	3	2	3	6	3	5	2	0	3	32
17	1	3	2	7	10	7	7	3	5	3	3	51
18 and up	3	9	6	18	21	10	11	7	15	9	16	125
TOTAL	9	18	12	29	37	26	22	15	23	12	23	226
GIRLS:												
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
15	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
16	0	1	2	4	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	13
17	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4	6	3	3	29
18 and up	0	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	4	5	7	27
TOTAL	1	2	4	5	9	12	9	5	10	9	10	76
RACE												
BOYS:												
White	9	16	8	24	26	20	15	11	16	10	14	169
Mexican American	0	2	3	5	10	6	5	2	5	2	7	47
Negro	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	0	2	10
TOTAL	9	18	12	29	37	26	22	15	23	12	23	226
GIRLS:												
White	0	1	3	5	7	8	9	5	7	3	6	54
Mexican American	1	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	3	3	3	17
Negro	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	5
American Indian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1	2	4	5	9	12	9	5	10	9	10	76

REMOVAL OF DELINQUENTS FROM NON-WARD STATUS
BY AGE AND RACE

		BOYS			GIRLS		
AGE:	TOTAL BOYS AND GIRLS	DISMISSED	TO FORMAL SUPERVISION	TOTAL	DISMISSED	TO FORMAL SUPERVISION	TOTAL
13	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
14	2	2	0	2	0	0	0
15	10	7	2	9	1	0	1
16	22	17	1	18	4	0	4
17	22	17	2	19	3	0	3
18 and up	30	25	0	25	5	0	5
TOTAL	87	68	5	73	13	1	14
RACE:							
White	72	59	3	62	10	0	10
Mexican American	14	8	2	10	3	1	4
Japanese	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	87	68	5	73	13	1	14

REMOVALS OF DELINQUENTS FROM NON-WARD STATUS

BY OFFENSE

OFFENSE	TOTAL BOYS AND GIRLS	BOYS			GIRLS		
		DISMISSED	TO FORMAL SUPERVISION	TOTAL	DISMISSED	TO FORMAL SUPERVISION	TOTAL
Assault	12	9	1	10	2	0	2
Burglary	14	13	0	13	1	0	1
Theft, Fraud	9	8	0	8	1	0	1
Auto Theft	3	2	1	3	0	0	0
Forgery	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Marijuana	10	8	1	9	1	0	1
Dangerous Drugs	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Other Drugs	3	1	0	1	2	0	2
Weapons	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Drunk Driving, Hit and Run	17	13	0	13	4	0	4
Other Specifics	6	5	1	6	0	0	0
Incorrigible	3	0	0	0	2	1	3
Liquor Offenses	3	3	0	3	0	0	0
Disorderly Conduct	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Truancy	2	2	0	2	0	0	0
Runaway, Transient	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	87	68	5	73	13	1	14

REMOVALS OF DELINQUENTS FROM INFORMAL STATUS

BY REFERRAL SOURCE

REFERRAL SOURCE	TOTAL BOYS AND GIRLS	BOYS			GIRLS		
		TERMINATED	PETITION FILED	TOTAL	TERMINATED	PETITION FILED	TOTAL
Law Enforcement Agency	482	330	39	369	96	17	113
School	46	20	8	28	15	3	18
Parents, Relative	23	10	1	11	9	3	12
Lower Court	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Other Juvenile Court	15	11	0	11	3	1	4
Superior Court	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Other	8	6	1	7	1	0	1
TOTAL	576	379	49	428	124	24	148

REMOVALS OF MINORS FROM INFORMAL STATUS

BY AGE AND RACE

	BOYS		GIRLS	
AGE	TERMINATED	PETITION FILED	TERMINATED	PETITION FILED
0-8	3	0	0	0
9	1	0	0	0
10	3	1	0	0
11	5	0	2	0
12	3	0	1	0
13	16	4	8	2
14	31	2	8	2
15	59	11	21	8
16	80	14	37	8
17	105	6	32	3
18 and up	73	11	15	1
TOTAL	379	49	124	24
RACE				
White	285	32	112	18
Mexican American	68	12	33	6
Negro	18	4	2	0
American Indian	2	0	1	0
Chinese	1	0	0	0
Other	4	1	0	0
Unknown	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	378	49	148	24

REMOVALS OF MINORS FROM INFORMAL STATUS

BY OFFENSE

OFFENSE	BOYS			GIRLS			
	TERMINATED	PETITION FILED	TOTAL	TERMINATED	PETITION FILED	TOTAL	GRAND TOTAL
Robbery	2	1	3	0	1	1	4
Assault	17	4	21	4	0	4	25
Burglary	65	7	72	5	1	6	78
Theft, Fraud	51	5	56	6	2	8	64
Auto Theft	15	2	17	0	0	0	17
Forgery	14	1	15	7	0	7	22
Rape, Forcible	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
Other Sex Offenses	4	0	4	0	0	0	4
Marijuana	73	5	78	10	0	10	88
Dangerous Drugs	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Other Drugs	12	2	14	4	0	4	18
Weapons	4	0	4	0	0	0	4
Drunk Driving, Hit and Run	7	0	7	1	0	1	8
Other Specifics	17	1	18	2	0	2	20
Incorrigible	46	6	52	41	9	50	102
Malicious Mischief	10	1	11	0	0	0	11
Liquor Offenses	9	3	12	7	1	8	20
Gas, Glue Sniffing	1	1	2	0	0	0	2
Loitering, Curfew	2	0	2	0	1	1	3
Disorderly Conduct	3	0	3	4	0	4	7
Truancy	19	7	26	13	2	15	41
Runaway, Transient	5	3	8	20	7	27	35
TOTAL	379	49	428	124	24	148	576

JUVENILE COURT DISPOSITION BY OFFENSE

OFFENSE	BOYS						GIRLS							TOTAL
	Transferred to Other County	Dismissed	Probation Without Wardship	Declared Wardship	Remand to Adult Court	Committed to C.Y.A.	TOTAL	Transferred to Other County	Dismissed	Probation Without Wardship	Declared Wardship	Remand to Adult Court	Committed to C.Y.A.	
Homicide	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manslaughter, Vehicular	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	2	1	6	1	1	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Assault	2	10	11	17	3	1	44	1	1	5	7	0	0	14
Burglary	7	9	17	59	0	0	92	1	0	0	5	0	0	6
Theft, Fraud	4	5	9	25	0	0	43	0	0	0	6	0	1	7
Auto Theft	4	2	3	10	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forgery	0	1	1	5	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Rape, Forcible	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Sex Offenses	1	1	0	4	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marijuana	2	6	10	27	0	0	45	1	2	0	1	0	0	4
Heroin, Other Narcotics	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dangerous Drugs	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Drugs	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Weapons	0	4	2	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drunk Driving, Hit and Run	6	6	16	12	0	0	40	2	1	5	1	0	0	9
Other Specifics	0	11	6	4	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Incorrigible	1	9	5	43	0	0	58	0	15	7	51	0	0	73
Malicious Mischief	0	3	3	6	0	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Liquor Offenses	1	2	2	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gas, Glue Sniffing	0	1	2	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Disorderly Conduct	0	1	0	4	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Truancy	0	2	2	12	0	0	16	0	1	1	8	0	0	10
Runaway, Transient	0	7	0	2	0	0	9	0	3	2	10	0	0	15
Runaway Other	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Loitering, Curfew	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

JUVENILE COURT DISPOSITIONS BY AGE
AND SOURCE

AGE AND SOURCE	BOYS							GIRLS						
	TOTAL	Committed to C.Y.A.	Remanded to Adult Court	Declared Ward	Probation Without Wardship	Dismissed	Transferred to Other County	TOTAL	Committed to C.Y.A.	Remanded to Adult Court	Declared Ward	Probation Without Wardship	Dismissed	Transferred to Other County
0-8	4	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	7	0	0	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	24	0	0	17	2	3	2	15	0	0	12	2	1	0
14	51	0	0	38	4	9	0	34	0	0	26	3	5	0
15	87	0	1	58	15	8	5	39	0	0	31	3	4	1
16	131	1	0	75	24	23	8	26	0	1	15	4	4	2
17	110	3	2	43	31	21	10	27	0	0	7	10	9	1
18	41	1	1	9	14	12	4	8	0	1	1	1	4	1
TOTAL	461	5	4	246	92	84	30	149	0	2	92	23	27	5
Other	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Juvenile Court	11	0	0	8	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	1
Lower Court	5	0	2	0	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0
Parent, Relative	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0
School	21	1	0	16	2	2	0	11	0	0	9	1	1	0
Law Enforcement Agency	416	4	2	219	89	74	28	125	0	1	75	21	24	4
Welfare Department	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0
Probation Department	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0
TOTAL	461	5	4	246	92	84	30	149	0	2	92	23	27	5

JUVENILE COURT DISPOSITIONS

BY RACE

DISPOSITIONS	Chinese	White	Mexican American	Negro	American Indian	Other	Total
BOYS:							
Transferred to Other County	0	27	2	0	0	0	30
Dismissed	0	66	11	7	0	0	84
Probation Without Wardship	0	74	15	2	0	1	92
Declared Ward	0	166	60	17	1	2	246
Remand to Adult Court	0	1	2	1	0	0	4
Committed to C.Y.A.	0	3	0	2	0	0	5
TOTAL:	0	337	90	29	1	4	461
GIRLS:							
Transferred to Other County	0	4	1	0	0	0	5
Dismissed	0	21	5	1	0	0	27
Probation Without Wardship	0	17	4	1	0	1	23
Declared Ward	1	65	20	3	2	1	92
Remand to Adult Court	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Committed to C.Y.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	1	108	31	5	2	2	149
COMBINED TOTAL:	1	445	121	34	3	6	610

SUBSEQUENT DELINQUENCY PETITION ADJUDICATIONS BY RACE AND AGE

ADJUDICATIONS	RACE							AGE								
	TOTAL	White	American Mexican	Negro	Indian American	Other	Unknown	TOTAL	0-8	12	13	14	15	16	17	18 and up
BOYS: Closed or Transferred	22	16	5	1	1	1	1	22	1	0	0	2	2	3	6	8
Prior Status Maintained	276	165	89	20	1	1	1	277	3	1	3	23	60	99	77	11
Formal Status Initiated	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0
Remand to Adult Court	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0
C.Y.A. Initial	9	5	3	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	0
C.Y.A. Recommitment	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1
C.Y.A. Turned Back	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
TOTAL:	323	195	104	22	1	1	1	324	4	1	3	27	67	112	90	20
GIRLS: Closed or Transferred	10	6	3	1	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	4
Prior Status Maintained	109	75	27	6	1	0	0	109	0	0	6	23	27	35	17	1
Formal Status Initiated	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Remand to Adult Court	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C.Y.A. Initial	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
C.Y.A. Recommitment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C.Y.A. Turned Back	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	121	81	32	7	1	0	0	121	0	0	7	23	30	38	18	5

SUBSEQUENT DELINQUENCY PETITION ADJUDICATIONS BY OFFENSE

	BOYS								GIRLS							
	TOTAL	C.Y.A. Turned Back	C.Y.A. Recommitment	C.Y.A. Initial	Remand to Adult Court	Formal Status Initiated	Prior Status Maintained	Closed or Transferred	TOTAL	C.Y.A. Turned Back	C.Y.A. Recommitment	C.Y.A. Initial	Remand to Adult Court	Formal Status Initiated	Prior Status Maintained	Closed or Transferred
Runaway Other	137	0	1	5	3	1	117	10	93	0	0	0	0	0	84	9
Runaway Transient	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Disorderly Conduct	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Loitering, Curfew	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liquor Offenses	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Malicious Mischief	5	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Incorrigible	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	3	0
Other Specifics	9	1	0	1	0	1	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Drunk Driving Hit and Run	13	0	0	0	1	1	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Other Drugs	6	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dangerous Drugs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Marijuana	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Other Sex Offenses	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forgery	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auto Theft	17	0	0	0	1	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Theft, Fraud	32	0	0	0	0	0	28	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Burglary	48	0	1	2	0	0	42	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assault	25	0	1	0	0	0	24	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	0
Robbery	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	324	2	4	9	5	5	227	22	121	0	1	0	0	1	109	10

INITIAL REFERRALS OF DELINQUENCY CASES BY AGE

BOYS	AGE											
REASON FOR REFERRAL	0-8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18 up	TOTAL
Traffic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Runaway	0	2	2	1	5	18	22	28	26	18	1	123
Truant	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	8	4	1	27
Disorderly Conduct	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	5	7	5	0	25
Loitering, Curfew Trespassing	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	2	8	1	17
Liquor, Gas, Glue Sniffing	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	22	34	4	78
Malicious Mischief	2	1	1	5	5	5	17	10	10	6	1	63
Incorrigible Sexual Delinquent	2	3	0	3	4	16	32	35	54	32	0	181
Other Specifics	3	2	0	0	0	4	7	19	34	50	4	123
Other Drugs	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	12	17	2	42
Dangerous Drugs	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	4
Heroin, Other Narcotics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
Marijuana	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	30	59	68	5	173
Other Sex Offenses	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	6	9	4	0	28
Rape, Forcible	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	6
Auto Theft	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	15	3	3	37
Theft, Forgery, Fraud	2	1	3	8	12	15	29	37	41	43	5	196
Burglary	1	0	1	4	13	28	34	40	55	33	5	214
Assault	1	0	1	4	3	9	10	26	15	31	5	105
Robbery	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	1	6	1	19
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
TOTAL	13	10	8	27	48	113	196	272	373	368	39	1467

INITIAL REFERRALS OF DELINQUENCY CASES BY AGE

GIRLS	AGE											
REASON FOR REFERRAL	0-8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18 up	TOTAL
Traffic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Runaway	0	0	0	1	1	21	31	50	45	29	1	179
Disorderly Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	0	6
Truant	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	3	3	0	26
Loitering, Curfew Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Liquor, Gas, Glue Sniffing	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	8	12	0	36
Malicious Mischief	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Incorrigible Sexual Delinquent	0	0	0	3	6	15	42	49	47	27	3	192
Other Specifics	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	10	3	20
Other Drugs	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	10	1	18
Dangerous Drugs	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Heroin, Other Narcotics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marijuana	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	9	7	0	29
Other Sex Offenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Rape, Forcible	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auto Theft	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3
Theft, Forgery, Fraud	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	6	18	14	3	51
Burglary	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4	1	0	21
Assault	0	0	1	2	2	2	4	6	10	8	0	35
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	2	7	12	53	106	149	159	125	12	625

INITIAL REFERRALS OF DELINQUENT CASES BY RACE

GIRLS	RACE								
REASON FOR REFERRAL	White	American Mexican	Negro	Indian American	Chinese	Japanese	Other	Unknown	Total
Traffic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Runaway	156	17	0	1	1	1	3	0	179
Truant	18	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	26
Disorderly Conduct	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Loitering, Curfew, Trespassing	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Liquor, Gas, Glue Sniffing	33	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Malicious Mischief	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Incorrigible, Sexual Delinquent	148	35	5	2	0	0	2	0	192
Other Specifics	14	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	20
Other Drugs	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Dangerous Drugs	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Heroin, Other Narcotics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marijuana	25	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	29
Other Sex Offenses	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Rape, Forcible	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auto Theft	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Theft, Fraud, Forgery	36	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	51
Burglary	16	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	21
Assault	23	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	35
Robbery	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	500	99	13	4	2	1	6	0	625

INITIAL REFERRALS OF DELINQUENT CASES BY RACE

BOYS	RACE								
REASON FOR REFERRAL	White	American Mexican	Negro	Indian American	Chinese	Japanese	Other	Unknown	Total
Traffic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Runaway	115	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Truant	17	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	27
Disorderly Conduct	17	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	25
Loitering, Curfew, Trespassing	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Liquor, Gas, Glue Sniffing	62	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	78
Malicious Mischief	57	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Incorrigible Sexual Delinquent	152	17	10	1	0	0	1	0	181
Other Specifics	85	33	5	0	0	0	0	0	123
Other Drugs	38	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	42
Dangerous Drugs	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Heroin, Other Narcotics	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Marijuana	144	23	3	0	0	0	3	0	173
Other Sex Offenses	21	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Rape, Forcible	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Auto Theft	31	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Theft, Fraud, Forgery	149	38	8	1	0	0	0	0	196
Burglary	156	42	16	0	0	0	0	0	214
Assault	71	21	11	2	0	0	0	0	105
Robbery	12	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	19
Homicide	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
TOTAL	1157	232	67	4	0	1	4	2	1465

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C123330259

University of California, Berkeley
Institute of Governmental Studies
Library

Annual report / Santa Barbara
County Probation Department..

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES LIBRARY
109 PHILOSOPHY HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CA 94720